

YOUTH UPSURGE
IN CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW



PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

JULY 1968

VOLUME 11, NO. 1, 15 CENTS

COMMUNIQUE

On the meeting of the Working Group set up to draft materials for the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties

A meeting of the Working Group set up to draft materials for the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties was held in Budapest over June 18-21. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following parties:

Communist Party of the United States of America, Communist Party of Argentina, Communist Party of Belgium, Bulgarian Communist Party, Brazilian Communist Party, Communist Party of Ceylon, Communist Party of Chile, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Guatemalan Party of Labor, Communist Party of Honduras, Communist Party of India, Iraqi Communist Party, People's Party of Iran, Communist Party of Israel, Communist Party of Canada, Communist Party of Colombia, Polish United Workers' Party, Lebanese Communist Party, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Mexican Communist Party, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, British Communist Party, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Communist Party of Germany, Italian Communist Party, People's Party of Panama, Portuguese Communist Party, Communist Party of Salvador, Commu-

nist Party of Spain, Syrian Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Sudanese Communist Party, Communist Party of Uruguay, Communist Party of Venezuela and the Communist Party working underground. The Rumanian Communist Party was represented by an observer.

Other fraternal parties that have agreed to participate in the International Conference were unable, for various reasons, to send representatives to the meeting of the Working Group.

The meeting discussed the content and the structure of the basic document of the Conference "The Tasks of the Struggle Against Imperialism at the Present Stage and the Unity of Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and of All Anti-Imperialist Forces." The meeting also agreed on the further activity of the Working Group. The atmosphere at the meeting was one of comradely cooperation and friendship in keeping with the internationalist traditions of the international Communist movement.

Budapest,
June 21, 1968.

WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

**World Marxist
Review**
**problems of peace
and socialism**

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

JULY, 1968
VOLUME 11
NUMBER 7

Authorized as Second
Class Mail, Post Office
Department, Ottawa and
for payment of postage
in cash. Printed in
Canada.
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
is the North American
edition of the monthly
journal Problems of Peace
and Socialism published
in Prague. The North
American edition is
published by Progress
Books, 487 Adelaide St.
West, Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada.

Copyright © 1968 by
Progress Books, Canada.
All Rights Reserved.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
\$3.50 a year. Single
copies 35 cents. Bundle
of five or more, 25 cents
per copy. Outside
Canada, add 15 cents
exchange.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM is also
published in French,
Russian, Bulgarian,
Czech, Dutch, German,
Greek, Hungarian,
Italian, Japanese,
Mongolian, Polish,
Rumanian, Spanish,
Swedish and Vietnamese.
Subscriptions to these
may be obtained through
Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, at \$3.50 a year.

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
487 Adelaide St. W.,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada.



WMR

CONTENTS

**3 Current problems of world communist
movement**

UPSURGE OF YOUTH MOVEMENT IN CAPITALIST
COUNTRIES: PRESENT FEATURES AND OUTLOOK

IMPERIALIST WAR POLICY AND UNITY
OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

PARTIES OF ACTION

W. JAROSINSKI

LEON BOR

45 The world today

ELECTION VICTORY OF COMMUNISTS
AND LEFT FORCES IN ITALY

FIRST THINGS FIRST: STOP THE BOMBING

VIOLENCE IN CITADEL OF "FREE WORLD"

CARLO GALUZZI

JAN PRAZSKY

SEAN BRENNIS

57 Theory and practice of building socialism

REFLECTIONS ON THE "PLAN AND MARKET" PROBLEM

50th ANNIVERSARY OF LENIN'S "THE IMMEDIATE
TASKS OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT"

W. BERGER
O. REINHOLD

L. SHKARENKOV

68 For national and social liberation

NEW SITUATION, NEW PROBLEMS (Fourth Congress
of Sudanese Communist Party)

THE ISRAELI-U.S. ALLIANCE IN ACTION

AFRICA: ECONOMIC INTEGRATION PROBLEMS

LATIN AMERICA: TWO EPOCHS AND
MARXISM-LENINISM

A. KH. MAHGOUB

S. KHAMIS

V. OPLUSTIL

L. BECERRA

94 Against the persecution of democrats

STOP THE TERROR AGAINST POLITICAL
PRISONERS IN IRAQ

S.A.

96 Books and journals

CALL TO VIGILANCE

BRIEF NOTICES

R. SOKOLOV

Upsurge of the youth movement in the capitalist countries

PRESENT FEATURES AND OUTLOOK

A round-table conference in Prague, June 12-13, under the auspices of this journal, examined the growing movements of the youth, especially the students, in the capitalist countries. On the invitation of the Editors, the discussion was attended by comrades dealing with youth problems from the fraternal parties of Italy, Spain, the Federal Republic of Germany, West Berlin and the United States.

The main contributions were made by Pierre Hentgès (French Communist Party), Giulietto Chieza (Italian Communist Party), Juan Diz (Communist Party of Spain), Willy Becker (Communist Party of Germany), Bruno Kuster (Socialist Unity Party of Germany—West Berlin) and M. B. Hallinan (Communist Party USA), with interventions by fraternal representatives on the journal's board, John Boyd, Canada; Ib Norlund, Denmark; P. Alberdi, Argentina; E. Zucker-Schilling, Austria; M. Cepeda, Colombia; J. Fortuny, Guatemala; V. Attias, Chile; and by E. G. Mancera, Secretary of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Venezuela.

Discussion was opened by G.P. Frantsov, *World Marxist Review* Editor-in-Chief. Whatever capitalist ideologists may say to the contrary, he pointed out, the stream of life flows not away from, but to Marx and Lenin. Their teaching does not fade in the distance, nor does it lose any of its outlines. On the contrary, surging forward, the stream of life delineates the main features of Marxism-Leninism in ever bolder relief.

What we are witnessing now, Frantsov said, is the end of the myth of capitalism's harmonious development, a myth carefully cultivated after the war as a counterweight to Marxism-Leninism, in which bourgeois theorists tried to picture Marx as the perfect bourgeois liberal. That the legend has burst is no longer denied by the West European capitalist press.

The illusion of an harmonious, non-conflict post-war capitalism, a society of the satisfied and contented, of a sunshine bourgeois-democratic development, is going up in the smoke of the realities in the United States and Western Europe. The unusually acute political crises and the discontent of the millions reveal the capitalist myth for what it really is.

This brings us to another myth: that of Western Europe having lost its historical significance. Volumes have been written in the post-war purporting to show that the West European social upheavals are antiquated compared with the "new society" in the United States, where, ostensibly, all conflict has long been resolved. This story of a senile Western Europe was subsequently translated into other languages and so construed as to stress the alleged senility of the West European working class, inferring that the vital forces of history advancing the world's revolutionary reconstruction were in evidence elsewhere, certainly not in the European continent.

Yet Western Europe is presently demonstrating the place it really occupies in history, a history that is first and foremost

the history of class struggle. The United States, too, is deeply shaken by profound social conflicts, restoring the truth about the foci of the revolutionary process.

One more "Big Lie" is folding: that about the youth, not the working class, being the dynamic force, at least in Western Europe, and the struggle of classes giving way to a struggle of generations, with the "spiritual elite" in undivided command of the historical process.

Frantsov recalled facts from Russian history. At one time, he noted, Russia was the only country of extensive student unrest. So much so, that many West European observers tended to describe it as yet another of the many "Russian riddles." But riddle there was not. The point was that Russia was pregnant with the bourgeois-democratic revolution. That was what the student unrest was about. The young intellectuals did not fit into the old tsarist social pattern with its outdated and inert bureaucratic machinery. A new social and political structure was needed.

Did all the young people taking part in the student unrest realize this? No, many had their pet illusions and followed illusory paths. But deep down among the people there matured that vast social energy which burst to the surface in its destructive and at once constructive force first in 1905 and again in 1917.

And it can be said of the present student unrest in the West European countries that it is a sure harbinger of profound social

change. The technological revolution is accentuating the role of the intelligentsia in production and society. Yet capitalism has squeezed the technological revolution into the narrow framework of the technico-bureaucratic hierarchy of the monopolies and their subordinate state institutions.

To be sure, Frantsov went on, the fight against this now and then assumes distorted forms of intellectual arrogance, anarchist individualism or reactionary dreams of Plato's republic where a spiritual elite handled all affairs. But that is the extraneous and the incidental spilling over here and there, and cannot obscure the basic truths of the ferment. What does the young intellectual brushed by the breeze of social daring and bold thought really want? What he wants is a social system that will give him the chance to develop his faculties, to work to the best of his ability and for the public weal. That is something only socialism can give him. But are all the participants in the student unrest conscious of this? No, as yet the mist of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois illusions is far too dense for that.

But the objective truth of history will win out once the intelligentsia opts for the working-class cause. That is a complex and contradictory process, but the signs that it has begun are at hand. Nor is it being allowed to run its course spontaneously, for the Communist parties have taken it in hand, living up to Lenin's description of them as the mind, conscience and honor of our age.

FRANCE

Pierre Hentgès said that a rapid advance of the student movement set in at the beginning of May. At the end of April the working-class movement, effective and deep-going, had not yet entered the phase of rapid growth that we were to witness later. So that the student movement claimed greater attention before it fused with the broader and more important movement. This came when in West Germany students demonstrated against the attempt on the life of Rudi Dutschke, and when the wave which had swept through Louvain, Madrid and Rome began to reach West Berlin. Soon it was lapping the walls of Paris.

I say "wave" but others variously described the upsurge as a "storm," an "earthquake," "chaos," and "explosion," a trans-

fusion of fresh blood, a "veritable revolution," while General de Gaulle invoked the term: "spiritual crisis." This idealist, religious—not to say vitalist—terminology contributed to the making of a myth. We know that in primitive society, when social production was at an exceedingly low level, when the forces of nature had still to be conquered by man, he subdued them "in and through his imagination."

Much the same can be said about the students. Far from all of them are really clear about the events. Nor does one find among the bourgeoisie a clear understanding of the happenings which it can no longer control. In these circumstances, all the confusion in the student movement assumes a fantastic form. For *Pierre Grappin*,

dean of the faculty of letters at Nanterre, the students were about "to establish some kind of imaginary republic." Estimates of this kind are grist to the mills of those who, generally speaking, belittle the role of the working class and among whom we find avowed champions of Gaullism.

In his television address on June 7 de Gaulle posed as a "revolutionary," the man whose duty it was to lead the revolution, as an angel who "after experiencing the upheaval," as the general phrased it, would enable the crowd "standing on the brink of the precipice to break loose from the grip of the evil demon."

On the other hand, Maurice Clavel, who writes for that muddled weekly *Nouvel Observateur*, commented: "It is significant that the chief rebel (for him, this rebel is not de Gaulle but the student Daniel Cohn-Bendit—P.H.) should be a sociologist or an anti-sociologist. And the consolation is that he has no clear-cut program nor has he any desire to establish some kind of order."

The same journalist wrote about his interview with a young man in whom he saw a manifestation of mysticism.

"A young man called on me three months ago. He had gained first place upon entering a very important research institute and finished second when he graduated; but he gave up everything—position, connections, riches and parents all for the sake of metaphysical searching. . . 'Suddenly,' he said to me, 'I saw my career, my life. And gripped with something like physical horror, I hesitated and retreated'."

It goes without saying that we should resist the temptation to laugh at these sentiments. There are, after all, problems of youth in any society, problems which have been studied by writers, psychologists and psychoanalysts. Whether a young man (or woman) is motivated, as the psychoanalysts put it, by the desire to impress his image on reality, or whether his "narcissism" is associated with aggressiveness—according to the psychoanalysts—whether he cannot accept the idea of being emancipated not by himself but by someone else, or whether he feels he must return blow for blow, all this is not unimportant. There have always been Tybalds and Mercutios; and Cohn-Bendit says very significantly and without the slightest irony that "it is typical of the small group to reject all that does not emanate from it."

We may also presume that the students' inadequate understanding of their difficul-

ties evokes in them "anxiety and, at times, anguish."

It is pretty obvious to me that all this may have provided favorable subjective conditions for the struggle in which the students have engaged. However, we cannot accept at their face value the illusions entertained by the bourgeoisie concerning the student movement, illusions which it is trying to spread, or equally the illusions of the students about their own conditions. When de Gaulle speaks of a "spiritual crisis," or when Pompidou speaks of a "crisis of our civilization," we should regard these first of all as a means of spreading confusion, of preventing a search for the real reasons for the student crisis and of stalling over much needed measures and reforms.

First of all, we must see clearly that many of the difficulties encountered by the students have to do with their conditions and that these conditions have been worsening with the growing domination of state-monopoly capitalism. The student is in an age group which the French military vocabulary terms as intermediate, putting the vast majority of them in a privileged position. They were a kind of pre-bourgeoisie. Whether they were prospective doctors, lawyers, public notaries, engineers or officers, most were destined to become part of the propertied classes. Today many students constitute also a kind of pre-proletariat in so far as large numbers of them are likely to join the new strata of technical intelligentsia, salaried doctors, and office employees who, with the growing concentration of production and the extending state-monopoly capitalism, become increasingly conscious of the conflict between their interests and those of the capitalist oligarchy. In a recent interview with *Le Nouvel Observateur* Cohn-Bendit spoke about "the students' refusal to be future cadres trained to exploit the working class." In reality, however, the students as future cadres have greater reason to fear that they too will be exploited in the same way as the working class.

But even when students are not conscious of the fate that awaits them in capitalist society they feel frustrated and weighed down by the burden of authoritarianism. Between them and society there is a deepgoing dissonance and they react to this by challenging things, protesting against them and by refusing to go with them. The French Communist Party in its document of May 12 attributed this senti-

ment to the capitalist system which prevents the students from "taking an active part in running the economy, in policy making, and in creating a dynamic culture."

Their demand, "student power," in a way expresses the feeling of being deprived of power, of rights and privileges. The worker is traditionally proud of being "class-conscious, and organized" in an influential party or union. But as far as the French student is concerned, whatever the role played by the Union of Communist Students or the more important but less consistent role played by the National Union of Students, they do not provide him with a comparable political and moral basis. Recall for a moment the statement by Cohn-Bendit, one which is indicative of an "external" attitude towards the working class: "Of course, our relations with the working class do not go beyond attempts to distribute leaflets. But should a strike break out, say, in Nanterre, I think we would have to do what the Italian students did at Fiat's — cooperate with the pickets and bring those workers who were willing into the university refectories. They would pay nothing. That would be taken care of."

But if students of petty-bourgeois origin have always been characterized by a feeling of frustration and by anarchist leanings, we should ask ourselves why it is only now in 1967 and 1968, that the tide is running high, extending from Berlin to Buenos Aires, from Columbia University to the University of Louvain, and from Senegal to Iceland.

It is important to note that in countries like France and West Germany these two years have been marked by the rise of mass unemployment and by multiplying signs of crisis. The unemployed in France number about 450,000, not counting the hundreds of thousands of young people ranging in age from 17 to 21 looking for jobs. On November 29, 1967, the French employer's weekly, *Les Echos*, had this to say about the situation created by the devaluation of the pound: "All (capitalist—P.H.) countries are disorientated and have no idea whither they are going." On March 19 last it commented on the deflation policy of the U.S.: "As a consequence the Western world in its turn runs the risk of being caught up in more or less serious recessions." Another French newspaper, *Les Informations Economique et Commerciales*, commented on January 19: "The whole period of expansion is drawing to an end throughout the Western economy—the period of easy expansion. . . . Another period

is setting in accompanied by currency instability, a slower international exchange, dearer credit and rising unemployment. The pie will grow more slowly . . ."

The last few years have seen a combination of two important facts. First, those who were born immediately after the war and who made up the new wave left secondary school and entered the university. Second, overall automation swelled the ranks of the industrial reserve army of labor. France now has 600,000 students, or three times as many as ten years ago, or the exact number of secondary school pupils in 1939.

Student discontent has been mounting in step with the advance of the new wave. At the same time public opinion has concentrated on two essential aspects of the university: student enrolment and the placing of graduates.

A poll held by the Institute of Public Opinion in the last quarter of 1957 revealed that only 29 per cent of the young people could study where they wished, 33 per cent could not and 38 per cent answered "partly."

Françoise Giroud, who concerned herself with these figures in *L'Express*, assessed them as evidence of the "inequality in education," although this inequality is felt least by those who are able to study.

The proportion of workers' children in the University is one-fifth of that of workers in the population, while children of executive personnel are represented by a number almost six times as great! Only six in 1,000 students belong to the category of agricultural laborers (1961/62) and 64 to that of workers. Furthermore, the situation varied greatly from university to university.

The share of working people's children in the university has slightly increased in the last decade. Today they make up eight per cent of the total of university students. But the fundamental problems remain.

In taking a stand on the student movement, the Communist Party bears in mind its mixed nature. The movement includes Maoists, Revolutionary Communist Youth—an organization grouping some Trotskyists—The Liaison Committee of Revolutionary Students—mainly Trotskyists—and anarchists. But the Party has always distinguished between the mass of students and these Leftist organizations. It has always warned against untimely demonstrations, against mere provocations likely to play into the hands of reaction and the government. When, on May 17, the Renault workers in Boulogne-Billancourt occupied

the plant they refused, at the insistence of the Communist Party and the CGT, to admit the students to the premises.

Nevertheless, all students suffer from the profound contradictions of the capitalist system. These contradictions affect the intellectual community in the same way as they affect workers. After all, are not 80 to 90 per cent of the intellectuals in the big capitalist countries wage-earners? There are at least 20,000 engineers, technicians and executive personnel presently looking for jobs in France, along with others.

"The students reject as unjust this system which you want to maintain," said Pierre Cot in the National Assembly debate following the first barricades. "All that it offers them, in fact, is the prospect of unemployment upon graduation, the impossibility of finding a home when they get married, the prospect of living in a society which sacrifices all cultural and social amenities to useless atom bombs."

"Before judging them," said Pierre Cot, turning to Premier Pompidou, "ask yourself whether the system you represent should not take the greater part of the blame, whether the indictment submitted by some of your friends should not be levelled against themselves."

What the students are actually fighting against is the capitalist system. In countries like France, we are now witnessing a fusion of the student and working-class movements. The Communist Party, in warning against Leftist provocations, stressed the need of a worker-student alliance. Following the brutal suppression of a student demonstration on the night of May 10-11 the two movements—those of the workers and students—merged on May 13, when, for the first time, ten million working people went on strike and when hundreds of thousands marched through Paris carrying a placard which read "Workers, teachers, students as one."

It is interesting to note that eleven days earlier Georges Marchais, secretary of the Central Committee had written in *L'Humanité*: "While the working class must play the decisive role in the fight for progress, democracy and socialism, it cannot achieve its aims alone. It needs allies. The students and the youth generally are among these necessary allies."

Let us look for a moment at the specific conditions in which the fusion came about.

The working-class movement had been fighting against Gaullist rule for ten years. It had demonstrated its fighting capacity

throughout the period ranging from the strikes against the Algerian coup in April 1961 to the miners' strike in 1963 and to the recent movement against the decrees directed against social security. At the trade union level, agreements had been reached on unity of action between the CGT and the Christian unions during the presidential election in 1965. In the political sphere, broader and more precise agreements had been reached on united action between the Communist Party and the Federation of the Left, notably in December 1966 and February 1968. Let us not forget that whereas in September 1958 de Gaulle secured 79.25 per cent of the votes, in March 1967 the Gaullist majority, elected under an unjust electoral system, polled a meagre 37.75 per cent of the votes.

This weakening of the Gaullist forces should be borne in mind by anyone who wants to understand the events that followed the student demonstrations between May 3 and 11 and the general strike of May 13, which came in response to the call of all the trade union organizations.

It so happened that the May 13 strike began shortly after Herbert Marcuse had submitted his thesis on Karl Marx to a UNESCO symposium. According to Marcuse, the working class, which is "manipulated" and "linked to the system of needs" and is conditioned by the ups and downs of mass consumption, can no longer play a revolutionary role.

"Only those who have no hope give us hope," said Marcuse, quoting the poet Walter Benjamin. In a paper read in Prague in September 1966, Marcuse accused Marxist dialectics of not "radicalizing" the transition to a new stage of history.

Lenin proved this kind of Leftist concept to be indefensible. I will quote a passage from his writings which shows Marcuse's error and enables us to appreciate the Communist policy in the events now taking place in France.

"True revolutionaries," said Lenin, "have mostly come a cropper when they began to write 'revolution' with a capital R, to elevate 'revolution' to something almost divine, to lose their heads, to lose the ability to reflect, weigh and ascertain in the coolest and most dispassionate manner at what moment, under what circumstances and in which sphere of action you must act in a revolutionary manner, and at what moment, under what circumstances and in which sphere you must turn to reformism."

Speaking about Marcuse, we cannot leave

him without noting that there is a reason for the attempts now being made to make him a myth, to make him the idol of "rebellious students." The bourgeoisie has an obvious interest in the claims about the "failure" of the working class, and it hopes to create a gulf between workers and students by letting Marcuse appeal to the "forces of intellectual subversion."

Besides, in making a myth of Marcuse, the idea is to prevent a closer look at the myth and at the man.

Marcuse, now 70-years old, is German by birth, and in the twenties worked as editor of *Gesellschaft*, theoretical journal of the German Social Democrats. In 1934 he lectured at Columbia University and in 1937 settled in the U.S. for good. During World War II Marcuse — and this is certainly worth noting — "did not hesitate," Serge Mallet of the United Socialist Party tells us in *Le Nouvel Observateur*, "to work for the Office of Strategic Services." Subsequently he found himself at the Russian Institute in Harvard, where he wrote a book on "Soviet Marxism."

Obviously, we should not confine ourselves to recalling Marcuse's past but should also furnish a political refutation of his theories. And the role of the working class and the Communist parties is, of course, the best refutation. The more the students realize how the working class is extending its struggle and drawing nearer to its goals, the greater will be their capacity for general political action. The development of the recent mass movement in France makes it possible to disprove Marcuse's ideas set out by Rudi Dutschke in an interview.

"A new revolutionary movement of the wage and salaried workers," said Dutschke, "can be formed only by carrying forward and extending the subversive activity of the groups which have already become politicized. Politicized groups are the weakest spots of capitalism in its last stage. Today they are the universities and schools."

We think the weakest link of the French capitalist chain, or rather the strongest weapon against it, is the extraordinary unity movement which has rallied the workers, peasants, professional and office workers and students against the Gaullist regime.

Just how do Marcuse and his followers help the students by classing them as "morbid, embittered, neurotic" and as "unfortunate products of the universal disorder?"

Most revealing perhaps is what Marcuse said in an interview with *Le Monde* on

April 11. "Everywhere and at all times," he said, "the overwhelming majority of students are conservative and even reactionary. So that student power, in the event of it being democratic, would be conservative or even reactionary."

Estimates of this kind can breed only pessimism and anarchy. Our view of the student movement is much more positive. Communist students take part in it in a different spirit, and we predict a different future for it.

To begin with, it would be wrong to regard the student movement as entirely autonomous and the students' struggle as a struggle only for their own interests, unaffected by what is taking place in other spheres. Even a cursory survey of the student movement as a whole (in the capitalist countries) shows that it is influenced by important world events and, in the final analysis, by the fight which the three great forces of the world revolutionary movement—the socialist countries, the national-liberation movement and the working class of the capitalist countries—are carrying on.

Students all over the world have demonstrated against the war in Vietnam. In Paris it was over Vietnam that the revolutionary student organizations and the reactionary United Front for South Vietnam clashed, first in January and then in April. Every student is more or less conscious of the significance of a conflict in which the most powerful capitalist nation is the aggressor and the small nation attacked by it enjoys the support of all the socialist countries and of all Communist parties. And the worldwide repercussions of this war have greatly aggravated all the economic, political and moral contradictions of the world.

I will not say that had it not been for the Vietnam war the Negroes' liberation movement in the United States or the Arab peoples' fight for freedom would not be there. Without it, however, these struggles would not have had so powerful an international impact. The same applies to the student struggle in a capitalist world pitting increasing forces against the front successfully held by the people of Vietnam. The missiles hitting the center of Saigon not only stupefy the American aggressor, they invite the youth of the capitalist world to join in the fight against imperialism and dampen their militarist ardor.

Students in West Berlin demonstrated against the Shah of Iran, in Madrid against Franco, at Louvain against the linguistic conflict setting Flemings and Walloons

against each other, in West Germany against the emergency laws, in Dakar against Senghor. There are other examples, but I think the ones I have listed are enough to show that while the movement is often a catalyst amplified by the information media, it is invariably bound up with broader struggles.

That is what facilitated the student movement merging with the working-class movement, at least in France. Just before the May 13 strike the Political Bureau of our Party said in its document:

"The French Communist Party identifies itself without qualification with the just struggle of the students.

"It is working to strengthen the unity of all the working-class forces fighting against the common enemy, for the common hope.

"The workers' and students' strike of Monday (note the phrase "*workers' and students'*."—P.H.) is a condemnation of the regime of the monopolies and their one-man rule. It confirms that the students' problems, like those of the workers, cannot be solved through repression, the sole reply of the despotic regime of the monopolies, but through a democracy paving the way to socialism."

Since then the Party has reaffirmed this position time and again. It fully supports the demands of the workers, students and peasants.

"The students," said Waldeck Rochet on May 31, "are engaged in a vast struggle for a democratic and modern reform of education. They demand a new university with structure, content and methods adapted to the modern world and the needs of the country."

It is important to note that the Communist Party and the Federation of the Left reached an agreement concerning education to which they referred in the joint declaration signed on June 1 and complementing the general agreement of February 24, 1968, as regards its economic and social sections.

The document envisages "cooperation between students and teachers on the management boards." The universities should enjoy ample autonomy freeing them from centralized bureaucracy. "This reform," the document specifies, "can be brought about by only the university itself, by the students and teachers, with support from the democratic state. It will enable everyone to participate in social, political and cultural activities and ensure him the continuous education required by modern society."

The document also provides for the funds

with which to effect the reform. It specifies that six per cent of the gross national product, or one-quarter of the present total of budget appropriations, should be allocated for this purpose and that a democratic system of scholarships and grants should be established.

These ideas were first expressed in substance in a draft democratic reform of education prepared by the Communist Party in 1966. The draft was worked out by more than 200 comrades, mostly teachers, and by engineers, doctors, cultural workers, students, and workers. It provides, among other things, for extensive autonomy for the universities, which are to be managed by boards made up of equal numbers of representatives of the authorities, teachers and students. In the various branches, all categories of teachers' and students' elected representatives are to take part in coordinating curricula and in studying the problems of knowledge tests and orientation.

This preparation by the Communists for the educational reform helped them to face up better in many respects than others to what had come as a "terrible shock" to General de Gaulle and to the French bourgeoisie.

During their occupation of the universities the students discussed precisely the problems of a university reform. Communist students, who were better prepared, often suggested the most reasonable solutions, or, if you will, the most democratic and popular ones.

In an account of events at the Medical School in Lille, *Le Monde* stressed this role of the Communist students, their moderation, the solidity of their organization, their work with the teachers who are members of the union of salaried medical workers. It was Communist students who prompted the election of parity committees of students and professors.

There is every reason to assume that this constructive and realistic attitude of the Communists is the best way to scale down or make the best of certain thorny demands, such as granting students the right to comment or to interrupt, or extending student participation in the selection of teachers.

I think it is important to point out that many of the reforms advocated by the students will change in content depending on whether France continues to be ruled by a regime subservient to the monopolies or whether it wins popular government. To abolish examinations—a measure bristling

in any case with difficulties—would be disastrous to those, for example, who graduate without a diploma and who have no connections in industry, commerce, etc., and selection through examinations would be succeeded by selection according to financial status, as Professor Kastler pointed out.

As for another problem, that of the autonomous university, it would be fair to ask whether an autonomy pushed too far, with the existing political regime left intact, would not result in higher education falling under the sway of the local authorities and private enterprise, as in the U.S. This question was posed in *Le Monde* by Maurice Duverger, who not irrelevantly queries the meaning of “freedom of the autonomous university of Clermont-Ferrand between the Michelin monopoly, the municipality and M. Giscard d’Estaing (reactionary member of parliament from Clermont-Ferrand. — P.H.).”

As we see, it would be hard to alter the structure of the university without altering the structure of society itself.

I would not say that even if this should come about all the difficulties would be overcome. Students sometimes have problems also in a socialist country. But these countries know neither unemployment nor the crises caused by the capitalist economic system. They are in a better position to plan the training or retraining of workers. The socialist regimes, by putting an end to private ownership of the means of production and exchange, to the influence of this property on the whole of cultural and social life, and by doing away with national and racial hatred, have created conditions in which they can control the evolution of social and moral problems in such a way that greater mastery of the forces of nature is matched by progress in humanizing man, meaning both man in general and the individual. And should problems arise in spite of everything, the socialist countries are in any case better equipped than others to understand and solve them. In contrast to the situation in the capitalist countries, this

takes place not mythically, not in imagination, but in reality. Speaking of the university and education in general, I wish to stress that the universities in the socialist countries, which are also faced with the problem of growing numbers of students, have for years been doing special research and taking steps to ensure that the object of education is not so much to instruct young people as to teach them to learn, to implant in them the seeds of knowledge rather than its fruits.

The Communist Party will continue to apply the strategy which enabled it to head the greatest struggle of the French working class since the Paris Commune. To the French Communists, the call for unity and vigilance is the best way to rally the masses to fight for a people’s government and democratic action.

Let us recall what Lenin said in 1916 about the heterogeneity of the revolutionary forces and what today sheds light on the situation in France and, I think, on the student problem in all its complexity. Lenin criticized naive notions about “pure” and definite revolutionary demands.

He wrote: “So one army lines up in one place and says, ‘We are for socialism,’ and another, somewhere else and says, ‘We are for imperialism,’ and that will be a social revolution! . . .”

“Whoever expects a ‘pure’ social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip-service to revolution without understanding what revolution is.

“The socialist revolution in Europe cannot be anything other than an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry oppressed and discontented elements. Inevitably, sections of the petty bourgeoisie and of the backward workers will participate in it—without such participation, mass struggle is impossible, without it no revolution is possible—and just as inevitably will they bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors. But objectively they will attack capital. . . .”

ITALY

(Giulietto Chiesa (Italian Communist Party) Speaking of the student movement in Italy (and this is probably true for the whole of Europe), we should not see it as a particular issue, one of many germinating in the body politic.

Student demands may center on the system of education, on cultural matters and similar things, but these are bound to lead them to a far wider range of problems, casting doubt on all aspects of society. In that sense, Italian Communists have

grounds for thinking that the students have entered the lists for structural reform. Though their demands concern but one aspect of the social structure (culture in the broadest sense), they have avoided the pitfall of corporatism and have come to grips with the capitalist reality as a whole. The developments in our country do not stem from an exclusive student "elite"; they concern the bulk of the university and secondary-school students. Fighting against higher schools in Italy becoming a kind of "ghetto" and against the authoritarian structure of the university and society, they groped for the rock-bottom causes of the unsatisfactory state of education in Italy, and came face to face with all the problems of the Italian revolutionary movement.

True to its tradition, the Communist Party stresses the important function of the progressive intellectuals as a motive force of revolution. Admittedly, the student movement is not yet a mature force with clear-cut socialist aims (in theoretical terms) and the right kind of strategy and tactics (in practical terms). Incontestably, their movement is of petty-bourgeois origin and, consequently, is disposed to various ideological deformations. Still, for large sections of the youth it has given outlet to strong anti-capitalist, anti-authoritarian, anti-imperialist sentiment. In Italy and throughout Europe we see for the first time a politically Left student movement.

This prompted us to take a positive view of the student movement in our country as an element of radicalization and a symptom of the general crisis of capitalism and imperialism. It would perhaps be wrong to describe it as the detonator of the present social and class explosions, but, beyond question, it has contributed substantially to the ripening of the social conflict which some thought had petered out for ever.

It may appear paradoxical, but accords entirely with our Marxist view of the historical process, that by virtue of their members' social origin, various groups in the student movement are sharply opposed to Communist and workers' parties in general, critical of our political course and often inclined to espouse other revolutionary models, applying them arbitrarily to our country. This derives from their deep-rooted mistrust of the revolutionary capacity of the working class in the capitalist countries, which they find "submissive" or, as they put it, "integrated into the capital-

ist system." At the same time, obviously overrating the self-regulating capacity of the imperialist system, they attribute to it the ability to reign indefinitely. As a result, they believe that imperialism is on the offensive, whereas, in effect, the opposite is true. However—and on the face of it this may look like a paradox—the struggle they have helped to generate bears out the political line of the Communists, namely, that the working class is not integrated into the system and that capitalism is gradually losing its ability to cope with crises and the resultant social tensions.

This has caused a radical shift among the "left" groups controlling and guiding the student movement alongside the Communists. In other words, the situation has become more lucid, drawing a visible line between the anti-Communists, the incorrigible enemies of the working class, and the mere victims of theoretical errors who can be won over to socialist strategy.

For this reason all attempts to establish a direct connection between students and workers outside and against the Communist Party became impracticable, confronting the more capable student leaders with the problem of their relationship and alliance with the Communists in terms of a constructive dialogue. And rest assured that we shall not be deterred by the unorthodoxy (purely formal) of some of their postures. On the contrary, we have created the maximum opportunities for the students to make contact with the working class in terms of practical action and theoretical discussion.

I might add that on the strength of the above we, too, have taken a self-critical view of the weaknesses and deficiencies in the conduct of our Party, which we intend to remedy as quickly as possible. The tendency towards bureaucracy and routine has all too often robbed the Party's political line of practical effectiveness, bearing out the criticism of important sectors of the student movement. We therefore intend to act with an open heart, with minds free from dogmatism, pursuing a policy of true unity. We see the students as a social force fighting for the reconstruction of society. We take an understanding view of, and support, their demands for autonomy. And we are determined to work in their movement through Communist students and outside it through the workers' organizations, discussing all problems in a unitarian fraternal spirit.

To be sure, many of the difficult problems will remain, and more are bound to arise in future. We are aware that political views inconsistent with those of the Communist students abound in the student movement, and we know, too, of the many objections to the attitude and to the theoretical views of some of the Communist Parties. Also, we are awake to the fact that Herbert Marcuse's "technologically advanced society" and Dutschke's "late capitalism" need to be combated publicly by Marxist-Leninist thought and practice, and we intend to do this as thoroughly as we can. However, to cope with our mission, that of socialist revolution in a developed capitalist country, we must attain political hegemony over all the dispersed forces still exposed to the ideological deformations peddled by the ruling classes, from which, however, they have already parted.

That is why we criticize the ossified (rather than dialectical) approach that introduces dissonance (rather than clarity). In Italy, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Britain, the past few months have shown that the most constructive and resourceful theoretical work goes on in the midst of struggle, in grappling with new and vital problems. On no account does this contradict the principles of Marxism-Leninism; the acid test of the problems of any highly-developed capitalist society only reaffirms them.

Should we focus attention on the mistakes of the student movement? Should we accentuate its obvious ideological distortions? Should we attack the students every time they criticize or misunderstand a Communist party or a trade union? Or should we concentrate on winning them over, putting aside the more acute issues of the polemics for the time being?

We opt for the latter course as the more acceptable and fruitful for the socialist revolution. The facts show that cooperation between the youth and student forces opposed to the system of exploitation and the organized working-class forces fighting for a new society is what the ruling classes fear most. Quite obviously, the bourgeoisie is eager to exploit the tensions and differences between student and working-class

organizations. It is up to us, therefore, to avoid anything likely to make its aims easier to accomplish.

The election campaign with its big success for the Communist Party was based on these very principles, which the facts have proved correct. We have won hundreds of thousands of new followers, including students, delivering them from the grip of the bourgeoisie and from the Social-Democrat supporters of the capitalist system. To open a second front to the left of the Communist Party would also mean barring the way to the deep-rooted demands for renovation. The facts show that the growth of the revolutionary forces does not follow immutable, pre-established rules.

In the capitalist West the Communist Parties face the fact that the working class already confronts the problems of power, and that socialism is on the order of the day. As we see it, therefore, it would be a grave error to divorce the problems of power from the union demands. This applies to the students as well as the working class.

Furthermore, the problems of democracy are intimately related to those of socialism, and solving the former requires that we should also tackle the latter without delay.

It is easy enough to criticize the various definitions of Cohn-Bendit, Dutschke or Marcuse. But would we not then miss the wood for the trees? After all, these definitions notwithstanding, there is now a broad movement of youth and students waging battle with extraordinary vigor. Allow me, therefore, to conclude with a quotation from Luigi Longo, General Secretary of our Party:

"Of late, the university has become the field of lively and passionate collisions between most varied ideas and positions. Fighting for its demands within the framework of the university order, the student movement has produced a unique form of struggle against the system and has raised issues related to strategy and tactics. We must admit that in concrete terms it has shaken the country politically, and has great positive value because it has proved to be a movement undermining the social system."

SPAIN

Juan Diz (Communist Party of Spain) expressed his satisfaction that the discussion was devoted specifically to the problems of the youth and student movements in the developed capitalist countries. These problems, he said, acquire particular importance now that Europe is the scene of a revolutionary upsurge. And at such times it is all-important, as Comrade Suslov noted in his report on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, that the working-class movement and Communist parties should have an *offensive* strategy.

We must proceed from the fact that youth movements, movements of the worker and student youth have sprung up, in some cases very powerful ones, which reject neo-capitalist society and opt for socialism. The events in France are, in effect, a striking confirmation of the fundamental tenets of Marxism regarding the class struggle and the decisive role of the working class. At the same time they testify to the bankruptcy of the neo-capitalist thesis which has been the pillar of bourgeois ideology of late. In this connection we think that Marxist theorists had shown a certain weakness and vacillation, had to a certain extent taken a defensive attitude in the struggle against the neo-capitalist ideology. Apologists of the latter, referring to the technological revolution, to economic growth, maintained that capitalism is now able to cope with the class struggle, to integrate the working class and avoid revolutions. We rejected these theories but did not properly examine the contradictions and features of so-called neo-capitalist society, did not bring out the new forms in which the contradictions in this society manifest themselves and become more acute, did not show how crises, like the one today gripping France, mature.

I.

I should like to touch on what is often referred to as the "revolt" of the youth. It is not at all a question of the ridiculous theory about the "battle of generations." The absurdity of this theory is evident. The point is that we should see and make the most of—in the interests of the class struggle, of the revolutionary process—the specific contradictions that have impelled the mass of the youth to take issue with the structure of monopoly capital. The specific

features of the situation in which this is happening should not be lost sight of, nor should they be underestimated.

First, the present "revolt" of the youth is not something new. In all revolutionary movements the youth was always a decisive factor. We know this, for example, from our own experience of the war of 1936-1939.

Second, the sociological factors in the aggregate should be borne in mind. It was only beginning with 1965 that the vacuum created by World War II began to be filled; a much more numerous younger generation is growing up now; larger numbers of young people are going into social labor or are approaching university age.

Let us ask ourselves the question: is it not rather because of the shape of things that the young people are more emphatically *rejecting* neo-capitalism than the older generation? Speaking in general terms, we know that human requirements are a historical concept. In their lifetime the older generation made the acquaintance of the automobile, air travel, television, the refrigerator, etc. All this means nothing today to young people in the developed capitalist countries. To their way of thinking all this is merely a starting point, not an ultimate objective. The aspirations of the contemporary youth are on a different plane. What neo-capitalist society is able to offer does not correspond to these aspirations. This is one of the reasons for the vigorous rejection of neo-capitalism by such broad sections of the youth.

We should also bear in mind the ideological situation in which this is happening. The youth is becoming conscious in a world that is in the midst of a technological revolution; the achievements in science are leading the young people to think that there is nothing that man cannot do. What for centuries was considered utterly impossible, even absurd—*flight to the moon*—has now become a concrete undertaking.

We are living in an age marked by a profound crisis in the moral values of the bourgeoisie. The restraints that religion and other concepts were for the young generation in its formative period are being swept aside.

To the youth of today the world is an ever changing one where tomorrow will be different from yesterday.

Another thing is that the youth of today are in the mass much more educated than

we were at their age. This is true not only of the student youth, but of the young worker and peasant as well. We see this even in Spain, despite all its backwardness. The young generation is, therefore, better equipped to appreciate this new reality, this process of change, and not only on a local but even on a world scale. The role played by the modern communication media and their impact on the thinking of the youth is considerable. They are now able to keep abreast of events in all parts of our planet.

The aforementioned factors should be seen in relation to the basic point, namely, that the youth of today are embarking on their future in the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism. In this epoch every new development in neo-capitalist society becomes the subject of debate, is called in question. The reality of the socialist world—thanks to the fact of its existence—is a constant negation of capitalism, a negation which the youth sense in a thousand different ways, even before, long before, they acquire a political outlook, a socialist outlook.

Let us examine in this connection some of the contradictions which bring the younger generation into conflict with neo-capitalist society. The young man enters a world where he thinks being equipped with technique he can scale all the heights. However, before long he sees that this society denies him the most elementary rights. Unemployment, deficiencies in the educational system, and a multitude of other problems confront the young people in their striving for a normal life.

On the other hand, the prolongation of human life objectively lessens the young person's chances of occupying a position or doing a responsible job suited to his abilities. I shall not speak of other social factors operating in the same direction, for they are well-known and evident.

We think that the thing that really sparked the present wave of the youth and student movements is the war in Vietnam.

One might say that the war in Vietnam has shown the younger generation the utter rottenness and abomination of imperialism. It has shown how the "model" society of neo-capitalism is committing genocide, is carrying racism to its most monstrous forms and injustice to its most inhuman limits. American imperialism, because of its crimes in Vietnam, has become an object of revulsion to people throughout the world.

The Vietnam war has started a big protest movement in the United States in which the youth are playing a considerable part.

A factor of vast importance on the world scale is the heroism of the people of Vietnam who have shown that even a small nation can today, with the help of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp in general, inflict defeats on the biggest imperialist power in the world.

This has contributed greatly to the youth becoming more aware of the problems of the Third World. The Cuban Revolution played a very big role in this respect. Hence the wide response among the youth to the heroic death of Che Guevara, murdered by the imperialists. Guevara's death became for the youth a symbol of protest, of irreconcilable struggle against imperialism; it alerted them to the key problems of today, to the crying problems of the underdeveloped countries, showed the terrible injustice that is the lot of the peoples doomed to exploitation, hunger and plunder by imperialism. Che Guevara is one of the beloved heroes of the Spanish youth.

I should also like to note that the protest or "revolt" of the youth is permeated with profound sympathy for socialism. The youth aspire to socialism, not the socialism of the Social-Democratic type but socialism as we understand it, the socialism that has triumphed in the countries where the Marxist-Leninist parties are in power.

And understandably, for all the problems that have provoked the protest or "revolt" of youth directly and on a broader plane, can be resolved only under socialism. To the youth embarking on their future it is the only alternative to the many problems bothering them—whether it is a question of rejecting imperialism and the struggle against it, of overcoming the monstrous consequences of underdevelopment, hatred of racism. Naturally, in all this there is a certain amount of confusion, misunderstanding and sometimes even direct manifestations of bourgeois ideology. However, it would be only fair to admit that certain weaknesses in our own ideological work have made for confusion and misunderstanding, and if they are to be overcome we must make greater efforts first to remedy our own deficiencies in the ideological sphere.

II.

Until now I have spoken about the youth

in general. I should now like to speak more concretely about the problems of the university youth. Here factors exist that derive basically from the technological revolution and the influence it exerts on the social structure of the youth.

The first obvious fact is the vast increase in recent years in the number of students in all countries. This applies to Spain as well, although the increase has been less. Thus, the students of today are a numerous body. Furthermore—and this is important from the revolutionary standpoint—it is a question of a mass that is *concentrated* in the faculties, institutes and university towns. This circumstance should make it clear that we need to revise, to a certain extent, our traditional scheme with respect to the student body. Formerly that part of the students who went over to the revolutionary camp constituted an insignificant minority. As Comrade Hentgès remarked, the students were a “pre-bourgeoisie.” When fascism was on the way up before World War II, students, it will be remembered, formed part of fascism’s mass base.

Although the percentage of students from working-class families is still low (in Spain it is negligible), the majority are no longer the children of a privileged minority; a large part of them are the children of professionals, and officials, from the middle sections of the population, the petty-bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. Thus, an end is being put to the traditional concept according to which the student just because he comes from a certain family is automatically eligible for a high or privileged post in bourgeois society.

Even in Spain where this process is slower than in other countries we see that the future of most of the students depends not so much on their antecedents as on the place they will be able to obtain on the labor market. The bulk of the students are entering the market for labor power as engineers, technicians, specialists and scientists. . . . But all this is taking place on a market that is subordinate to the laws of monopoly capital.

This is where, in our opinion, there is an objective basis for the student and working-class movements finding points of coincidence and contact; here, too, is the objective reason for the student movement inclining towards socialism.

In the light of this the student problem should be seen as part of a more general problem. In our opinion, not only the stu-

dent body but also technicians, engineers, the teaching staff and intelligentsia have become a stratum of increasing social weight in modern society. It is a stratum that is steadily developing, being connected with the most advanced sectors of production, a stratum made up of wage workers whose functions are more and more acquiring a collective, social character. And because of their specific, or as one might put it, rationalization mission, they come into conflict already at this level with the irrationality of the capitalist system of ownership.

This leads us to the conclusion that in the developed capitalist countries this stratum represents one of the motive forces of the revolution today. In the past two years our Party has based its political line on the thesis that in present-day Spain the alliance of social forces capable of carrying out a socialist revolution is not only that of workers and peasants. We call it the “*alliance of the forces of labor and culture*.” Besides the working class and peasantry, it includes intellectuals, professionals, technicians and students.

It is clear, of course, that these forces do not spontaneously become a *motive force* in the revolution, because they are under strong pressure from the bourgeoisie, are under the influence of bourgeois ideology. But then so are the peasantry for that matter.

The experience of our work in the recent period in the political, ideological and even organizational spheres, work aimed at forming such an alliance, shows that this thesis corresponds to the reality in our country, that it is a matter of an idea being converted into action.

We also think that the concept of such an alliance is of importance in perspective, if we consider the concrete problems connected with the conquest of power by the progressive and anti-monopoly forces.

Broadly speaking, the revolutionary movement has many possibilities for undermining the state apparatus of monopoly capital. This apparatus is no longer what it was 30 or 40 years ago: it is now dependent to a considerable extent on specialists.

Our Party envisages a *general strike* as a means of struggle to overthrow the Franco dictatorship. We envisage it precisely as a form of struggle which will combine the general strike of the proletariat with participation in it of all other sections of the population: peasants, students,

technicians, engineers, tradesmen, clergy, etc.

To return to the problems of the student movement, specifically that of the Leftist tendencies among the revolutionary students.

Our experience shows that anarchistic tendencies are, naturally, the consequence of petty-bourgeois influence, but it is also a question of immaturity. This happens in the initial period of the working-class movement when it has not yet reached the maturity that would enable it to create its own ideology and, consequently, to combat such tendencies. It is not surprising that when new social strata, such as the students, join the revolutionary struggle, anarchistic, Leftist sentiments should appear among them. The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois roots can undoubtedly nurture anti-communist tendencies.

But our own experience is that much in this respect depends on our activity. In our work with the students the important thing is to rely on the objective coincidence of the protest of the student body and their rejection of capitalism with the protest of the working-class movement. The important thing is to rely on the tendency in the student movement to side with the working class, to rely on the enormous power of attraction that Marxism has for the students. This attraction is becoming widespread in Spain where there are no legal possibilities for dissemination of Marxism.

It took the Communist Party and its student organizations many years before they were able to convince the student body that they could resolve their problems only in joint action with the working class. At first we encountered incomprehension. Today we have achieved our aim, both in the big universities and in the universities in the provinces. The gratifying feature is that it was the Party's influence, its efforts that brought the student masses to joint struggle with the working class. Contact now exists between the Democratic Students' Union and the Workers' Commissions. During the last demonstrations, held in response to the call of the Workers' Commissions, the Students' Union in many cities officially adhered to the platform of the Workers' Commissions and their call to hold demonstrations on April 30 and May 1.

Ideological struggle against the Leftist tendencies is waged on a number of issues projected by the student movement itself.

What are the important points discussed with the representatives of the Left? One is the attempt to oppose the fight for democratic liberties to the fight for socialism. We must show that the struggle for democratic liberties is basic to socialism, that the struggle for democracy and socialism are elements of one and the same process.

Another point is the correlation between the parliamentary form of struggle and the revolutionary struggle of the masses. Explaining our conception we show that the use of the parliamentary form of struggle does not contradict the revolutionary perspective, that it is one of its elements. The mobilization of the working masses, their struggle, is, naturally, the decisive factor in this perspective.

In the polemic with representatives of the Left tendencies it is important to underscore that some of their views coincide with the old reformist postulates: for example, disregard for democratic liberties brings to mind the old reformist refrain that the working class should not participate in the bourgeois revolution, thus leaving the field clear for bourgeois influence. Our experience shows that such discussions with the students are useful, that in many cases they are confused or simply ignorant about revolutionary tactics. We are of the opinion that it would be wrong to equate the individual anti-communist attitudes to be observed in these youth circles with the anti-communism of the bourgeoisie.

We have seen that in some cases criticism from the Left made by young revolutionaries prompted salutary self-critical reflection. For example, if the Party is unable at some particular instance or particular moment to bring out the connection between the fight for immediate demands and the subsequent fight for socialism, this, naturally, exposes us to criticism from the Left.

III.

In Spain we have the illegal League of Communist Youth, which was re-formed in 1961 when the influx of young people into the Party necessitated the establishment of a separate organization for the youth. Already then it counted a membership of thousands, including a large percentage of girls. The League grew in the course of mass actions. Its members worked in legal

clubs seeking all possible forms that would enable the League to establish contact with the young people.

Average age of League officials is 18-20 years. Its committees enjoy a large measure of autonomy in their work which is mostly among the worker and peasant youth and secondary school pupils.

I should like to speak in greater detail about two mass movements which have specific features of their own. First about the movement of the Working Youth Commissions. These originated in the Worker Commissions which unite and rally the working class in our country and play a vanguard role in the democratic movement.

To date there are hundreds of Working Youth Commissions in the enterprises and in residential areas.

At meetings of young workers held in factories or clubs, sometimes in churches and not infrequently in woods, these commissions draw up their platforms of demands. These, naturally, are not something separate from the general platform of the Worker Commissions, but rather a further elaboration of it.

The Youth Commissions plan their own mass actions but these dovetail, so to speak, with the general strategy of the actions of the working-class movement. Thus the April 18 demonstration in Madrid of the working youth called by the Youth Commissions in support of their demands was part of the preparations for the big actions held on April 30 and May 1 in which the entire democratic and working-class movement participated. Through these Commissions we are able to popularize the program of the Worker Commissions among the youth.

The Youth Commissions include, in addition to young Communists, large groups of Catholics and representatives of other trends. But what is particularly important is that the commissions unite large numbers of young workers who, although they have no clear political viewpoint, participate through these organizations in the revolutionary struggle.

As regards work in the Democratic Students' Union, the Communist Party plays the leading role in this movement which embraces the overwhelming majority of Spain's student body of approximately 100,000. Since October last year the students have been opposing the dictatorship in the most diverse forms, including street fighting, and often displaying a high degree

of militancy. The students fought on the barricades against the police in Madrid and in such a traditionally conservative town as Santiago de Compostela, far removed from the mainstream of the political struggle.

As to the factors enabling—or which enabled—the Communist Party to play the leading role in this movement, in addition to the ideological and political elements of which I have already spoken, mention should be made of the organizational forms of the Party's activity in the student movement.

Regular Party organizations are formed among the students, that is, the Communist students do not set up any independent or special kind of organization. In this way we aim that all Party committees, beginning with the district and ending with the Central Committee, treat the problems of the university and the student body as their own. This is not always easy. But it is extremely important because we consider that only to the extent student problems are resolved in the Party, and its various bodies tackle the student problems the way they do the problems of the working class and other sections of the population, only to that extent will the Party be able correctly to orientate and establish contact with the student movement.

Party committees in the universities are composed exclusively of students. Although they receive general political direction from the district committees, they exercise their discretion in carrying out Party policy on the campus. For example, our student committees in the universities of Madrid, Barcelona and Valencia publish newspapers on their own responsibility.

Another feature is that the Party organizations have surrounded themselves, so to speak, with various flexible forms of organization such as seminars and debating societies in which Communists explain Party policy, discuss it with sympathizers and other revolutionary students. In other words, our Party organizations unite broad sections of the revolutionary students who participate jointly not only in militant actions but also in political and ideological debates. As regards attracting new members into the Party, we are doing much in this direction.

Today when Spain is in the grip of a crisis and Franco's fascist dictatorship is showing signs of being on the way out, we see not only middle class students but also

students from the ruling circles, taking a revolutionary stand.

The Democratic Students' Union came into being in the course of the students' struggle against the official structure which the Franco regime sought to impose on the universities in the shape of the so-called University Union, a typically fascist organization. When it fell apart as a result of the student movement the government tried to get the students to accept another, the Professional Association of Students. But this, too, was rejected by the student movement which insisted on forming a democratic union. The Committees of the Democratic Students' Union in the faculties, in the institutes and universities are elected democratically. The elections themselves are a fierce battle against the government authorities. These are held either independently, in defiance of the decision of the academic authorities, or the students participate in those held by the authorities taking into consideration that the elected body will eventually break with the official structure and join the democratic union and the democratic student movement. Despite the repressions, the fact that hundreds of students were thrown into prison for organizing their democratic union, this union exists and is active throughout Spain. The world press has reported its important role in the democratic struggle.

In their work among the student body the Communists take into consideration that there is a revolutionary minority, reaching several thousand in some towns, who hold radical views and are on a rather high political level. These students want to fight the authorities and even favor a socialist revolution. We are anxious to reinforce this revolutionary vanguard of the student body, to hold demonstrations jointly with the working class. Concerned with deeds and not words, we pose the question

as follows: no one stands to the left of the Communists.

At the same time there is still a considerable body of students, and this applies particularly to Spain, who have not yet reached the level of revolutionary struggle and who are concerned primarily with professional and democratic demands. Our role, the role of Communists—and we think it is in this way that the Party can ensure its leading role—is not only to advance to more resolute actions but to achieve that the Democratic Union draw into its ranks and rally the less active students. This is essential if the struggle is to acquire a truly mass character.

We have succeeded in getting the student movement to establish contact with other movements, to involve faculty members and other representatives of the intelligentsia in student actions, to influence the parents of students, church circles, etc.

The Democratic Students' Union has elaborated a program of democratic reform for the university. The students are working to establish joint committees with the progressive faculty members. The program unequivocally states that a democratic university can be attained only through the democratic reconstruction of society.

Time does not allow for a detailed description of the program. But I think it is clear from what has been said that it offers wide opportunities for joint struggle with the Workers' Commissions and the entire democratic movement.

In conclusion, I should like to say that in our view it is particularly important now, at this stage, to promote discussion, a free exchange of views among the Communist parties on all problems relating to the youth. Entirely new and important tasks face us today. An exchange of views is therefore very necessary. That is why we so highly appreciate the present discussion.

FRG

This discussion sponsored by *World Marxist Review*, will undoubtedly be of considerable interest to the Communist parties, said W. L. Becker (Communist Party of Germany). I regard it as an important contribution to the elaboration of new viewpoints on the strategy and tactics of work among the youth.

Some weeks ago a leading capitalist paper

in Federal Germany wrote: "What, actually, is happening in Germany? Are the Germans moving towards radicalization?" Not to speak of the fact that the word "Germany" in this context refers to West Germany and that its claim to representing all Germans is further accentuated in this form, I think that the above questions reflect the alarm of the bourgeoisie at the mounting

struggle of the working class and other sections of the population, particularly the youth. I should like to draw attention first to some features of the situation in the Federal Republic that distinguished it from other countries before the big movement started.

For many years West Germany boasted a prospering economy. This gave rise to illusions among the youth regarding capitalism, confused them about the actual conditions of the working class. Furthermore, their minds were conditioned by a subtly devised system of anti-communism.

An idea of the problems facing us may be gathered from the fact that there are about 800 youth organizations in the Federal Republic. Since 1951 when the Free German Youth League was banned we no longer have a youth organization guided in its work by the teaching of Marx and Engels.

In 1966, for the first time since the end of the war, West German capitalism was hit by an economic crisis that had profound political and financial consequences. One of these was the formation of the CDU-Social Democrat coalition government.

Beginning with 1967 the various youth movements and trends, after a long interval, acquired a class coloring. The events of the past two years show that Bonn's ruling circles have not been able, despite their efforts, to conceal the contradictions of capitalism from the youth.

Our Party closely followed the Karlovy Vary meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties which stated that the place of the youth is in the van of the struggle against war, reaction and fascism, and for freedom and progress. I can say here that the active part of West Germany's youth is living up to this.

Several years ago our Party expressed the view that developments in the Federal Republic were moving towards a polarization of forces. This process is now under way, with the reactionary, Right forces rapidly drawing together at one end and, at the other, the forces of the democratic and anti-imperialist front. Because of this turn to the Right the young people are finding it difficult to orientate, to realize that their place is in the forefront of the struggle. To mention but two signs of this turn to the Right. Recently the Constitution was replaced by the Emergency Laws, thus legalizing the move to the Right and paving the way to a fascist revival in West Germany. The second sign, one that is becom-

ing increasingly clear to all, is the growth of neo-nazism. The neo-nazi NDP has won parliamentary seats in seven of the ten Laender. This party, too, is supported by big capital.

Although the youth of the Federal Republic had taken an active stand in recent years on crucial issues (recall the disarmament campaign, known as the Easter Marches), beginning with 1967 their movement became more widespread and dynamic, acquiring a more pronounced political character. Today the various youth organizations are advancing demands directed against the system as a whole. For the first time in this period—from the end of 1966 and the beginning of 1967—large groups of students are taking part in the anti-imperialist and democratic struggle.

Considering that the principal youth organization had been in the hands of the nazis even before fascism came to power in 1933, the fact that it has been possible for the first time in the history of German imperialism to organize such powerful anti-imperialist and democratic student actions is all the more significant. Here it will not be out of place to note that about three years ago the leadership of the student organizations in the Federal Republic played a negative role, mainly one of support for the policy of the ruling circles. In those days the students were the darlings of the bourgeoisie. But that is not the case today. Now the rulers are hitting hard at the student movement — resorting to terror, coercion and abuse.

Last year saw the beginning of strong political trends also in the schools. School pupils formed a number of organizations of their own such as the Socialist School Union and the Union of Independent and Socialist School Pupils.

Trade Union and Social-Democratic youth conferences held in recent months advanced their alternatives to the CDU/SDP coalition policy—recognition of the German Democratic Republic, democratic reforms, the renovation of our entire society. There is every indication that the democratic and socialist youth forces will continue to act jointly, provided, of course, the Party and the democratic forces are able to explain to the youth what are the strategic and tactical tasks, and to counter the anarchist influence. I think that the peasantry which carried out big demonstrations in recent weeks—250,000 farmers demonstrated, the largest number in the history of the Federal Republic—should be drawn into this alli-

ance. True, there is the danger that all these movements, and particularly that of the peasants, might swing to the Right.

Such are some aspects of the political background in the Federal Republic that should help better to understand the sudden flare up of our youth actions.

At present much nonsense is expressed in the Federal Republic about the young people, distorting their attitudes and maligning them. In February, a contributor to *Rheinischer Merkur*, central organ of the CDU, wrote: "I would never want to be young again." "Youth," he continued, "is 'the most false, the most imperfect age,' of the individual."

Why this animosity? Clearly it is one way of hitting at the militancy of the young people. Anti-communism is supplemented with a variety of ideologies hostile to the youth. As in France, Italy and other countries, bourgeois ideologists divide our society too into younger and older generations. This imaginary conflict between the generations is presented as a regulator of society. *Der Spiegel* commented in No. 41 (1967) as follows: "The shaken and at the same time fascinated world of the older generation is closely following the actions of the youth."

Obviously the purpose of these and similar interpretations is to bolster the bourgeois consciousness. They should be seen, I think, as a politico-ideological weapon, an attempt to use certain features of the youth against their basic class positions and to conceal the class contradictions. We, Communists, can, in my view, expose these concepts showing that the root causes for the youth movement should not be sought outside existing production and class relations and their interaction, but in the aggravation of the class contradictions.

The anatomy of the social development of the youth in the Federal Republic is determined by the political economy of state-monopoly capitalism. In my view there is no such thing as an economic, political and ideological history of the youth separate from economics and politics. In each case the features of the youth and other social groups are determined by economic and political development. Consequently, the independent militant actions of the youth against imperialism are not a struggle of a "generation of a new type" against other generations; they are a struggle against the established capitalist system. Hence, they are not an expression of the strivings of some special "class of youth" allegedly existing alongside the working class, intel-

ligentsia and the peasantry, but a relatively independent development in the political movement of the existing classes.

I would like, however, to note that a section of the bourgeoisie approaches this question more soberly than was done by *Der Spiegel*. Von Heidebreck, a CDU spokesman who chaired a conference of ministers of culture said that the students had drawn up a list of demands, starting with democratic, and up to the demand for "liquidation of our social system." Another bourgeois spokesman declared that it is the first time in years that the youth have taken such vigorous action, that more than one generation has grown up since this last happened. Parliament has had to discuss youth issues three times in the past eight months, something unheard of in the history of German imperialism. The official record of the debate speaks about the youth "without a future," who have no model worthy of imitation, and who are at a loss what course to follow. *Die Welt* writes: "Questions about future goals, about the future in general, are being asked more and more frequently."

All this shows that the youth movement has in the past two years advanced important demands aimed at renovating our society, that there is a growing interest in socialism, in Marxism. For many young people, the policy of the Communist Party of Germany has become a powerful force of attraction.

Some time ago the organization "Indivisible Germany," which plays a decisive part in spreading revanchist concepts and is particularly virulent against the GDR, held a seminar on the subject, "The crisis of the politically-involved students." Addressing the Bonn ministers and representatives of the Bundestag parties present at the seminar, a representative of the democratic, anti-imperialist opposition in the Federal Republic declared: "It is not a question of a student crisis in the Federal Republic but of a crisis among you, gentlemen."

Yes, it is a matter of the crisis of state-monopoly capitalism, of the crisis of its policy in relation to the youth. I should like to discuss some of the contradictions that have begun to surface among the youth. Comrade Juan Diz referred to the profound contradiction between the people's desire for peace and the crimes of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. To make matters worse, the FRG government is the only West European government that is rendering not only moral-political, but also eco-

conomic and financial aid to America's dirty war. However, the youth militants have taken heart at seeing a small nation, relying on proletarian internationalism, inflict telling blows on the USA—the world gendarme.

I should like to mention that in his *Project for Europe*, Strauss, one of the more reactionary ministers in the Bonn government, advised the West German youth that they, too, might find themselves in a situation when they would have to make sacrifices as, for example, the Americans made in the Dominican Republic and as they are making in Vietnam! And in some youth papers we read that "The heroes of our times are the U.S. marines."

In the past two years a big change has taken place in the attitude of the youth to Vietnam; they are now taking a more class-conscious stand. This explains the widespread solidarity with the Vietnam people, and also the antipathy towards the cold-war policy pursued by the government. *Die Welt* commented in January, for example: "The attitude of the young generation to NATO is one of increasing scepticism. More and more young people regard the Atlantic Alliance as a survival of the cold war."

Our youth are also sharply aware of another contradiction—that between the concepts of freedom and democracy, and the drive against democratic rights by the ruling circles with the enactment of the Emergency Laws. It was in the fight to preserve the Constitution that the youth of the Federal Republic first experienced police brutality. In the past 10-15 years there was nothing like the terror unleashed against the youth during the past few months. These brutal measures had the backing of the Social-Democrat ministers. Our youth are denied the basic, elementary rights won by the older generation in long struggle. Thus, they are not granted suffrage at the age of 18; are paid less up to the age of 21; elected representatives of the youth in factories have no protection against dismissals. Students are vigorously opposing the authoritarian structure of the universities.

Yet another contradiction is that between the technological revolution and the extremely low educational level in the Federal Republic. This may surprise you, considering that the FRG is a highly developed capitalist country, ranking as the second industrial power in the capitalist world. The restrictions in education are stringent, the privileges extended to some have not been abolished. The curriculum is still

reactionary in content. Workers' children are particularly barred from university: they account for a mere five per cent of the student body.

Since the formation of the CDU/CSU/SDP coalition at the end of 1966, when many young people hoped that their demands which they had voiced over the years, would be met, the contradictions between the interests of the youth and the government's practical policy have become more glaring. We hold one of the root causes of the present movement in our country is that vocational training is hopelessly behind the requirements of the times, being based on the law of 1869. Even the capitalist press complains that half of our young people waste their time in learning a trade. To cite a few figures: 58 per cent of the workers in the automobile industry, 51 per cent of the mechanical engineers, 50 per cent of the fitters, 47 per cent of the toolmakers, 64 per cent of the workers of the footwear industry are no longer working in their trades. Thus, along with the sorry state of affairs in education beginning with elementary, secondary and vocational schools and ending with the university, we get a situation in which people are not able to work at their skills.

The antagonisms that triggered the movements of the past two years are also evident in the government's strenuous efforts to bring the various youth organizations, whether Social-Democratic or religious, under control of the ruling circles and to get these organizations to support a reactionary policy. To this end, administrative and political coercion is employed. Ever larger numbers of the youth, students included, are vigorously resisting these attempts. A new feature is that the politically active students see through the government's manipulations more easily now.

Summing up, I should like to say that more and more young people are beginning to realize that their future is not with imperialism. True, they are still far from being clear as to what the future should be. Their concepts range from the bourgeois-democratic to the socialist. But what they do realize is that our society must be remoulded.

There are two new developments in the present movements that we welcome. One is the growing solidarity of the workers with the students and, correspondingly, that of the students with the workers. Many actions are undertaken jointly. Since the attempt on the life of Rudi

Dutschke worker-student committees have been formed in many towns. These committees began with preparing the May Day measures and actions against adoption of the Emergency Laws. The second development is the growing movement for joint action, but this process is slower than the situation warrants. The swing to the Right, on the other hand, as I have said, is proceeding faster, and this is fraught with grave dangers to our country.

Now about another aspect of the matter, namely, the divisive tactics of our opponents.

They have elaborated a series of measures aimed at preventing the various youth groups and forces from participating in the movement, and integrating them in the system. These measures also include smear campaigns against the minority groups. Young people engaged in opposition activity are denounced as brawlers and trouble-makers. Young Socialists and other representatives of the youth are denounced as "Left fascists." The purpose is to set the working class against the students.

Shortly after the attempt on the life of Rudi Dutschke the Government resorted to police action to crush the student demonstrations; now the Bonn rulers are setting up their own committees and movements in an attempt to organize a student union as a counterweight to the existing Union of German Students. I should explain that in the Federal Republic membership in this Union is obligatory for all students. And because it has been following a course not to their liking, the bourgeoisie, government, the SDP, NPD and a host of other forces are doing everything to wreck it. The authorities also obstruct the activity of the Union of Socialist Students. Thus the enemy is determined to split the opposition forces, using every means to this end—physical terror and the most refined methods.

At present the coalition parties are seeking, through "reforms from above," to "devitalize" the demands advanced by our youth. And needless to say, these "reforms" are anything but democratic.

Despite its success the student movement is beset by numerous difficulties, not least of them the diverse ideological trends current among the students—Trotskyite, pseudo-Marxist, Maoist, anarchist and other. Discussions in the movement have revealed that most of the forward-looking student groups lack a constructive alternative. Although our Party has achieved con-

siderable success in its work among the Socialist students, at their last delegates' conference they advanced disturbing arguments against our Party and against other Communist parties. I am referring to the opposition to the "traditionalists," (as they call us). The attacks are chiefly against the concept of Leninism.

The idea is to project an image of the Communist Party as being, like the trade unions, the government and the SPD, a part of the Establishment. The so-called criticism from the Left runs as follows: We do not agree with the Communist Party which has abandoned its one-time revolutionary positions. Our criticism of the Communist Party is therefore not anti-Communist, but Communist, for we are upholding revolution. In the guise of combating authoritarianism some groups are, in effect, combating everything.

Recent weeks have seen regrettable developments in some of the universities: student organizations have dissolved themselves on the grounds that any form of organization is already an expression of the established order, that the previous forms of organization are outdated, that the rallying of forces for action can only be spontaneous. Complex processes are now under way in the student movement which might hamper its advance and the achieving of a broad alliance; and this at a time when there is no legal Communist Party in the country.

Lastly I should like to say a few words about the role of the Party and Communist Youth in this movement. I have tried to give a picture of the growing contradictions between the conflicting interests in the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism, and the underlying causes of the present movement. How has the Communist Party participated in this movement? I think it would be no exaggeration to say that in most of the actions and demonstrations held since the assassination of Benno Ohnesorg last year it has established good relations with the students and other democratic forces. We were able to organize a big Easter March—the biggest of its kind—in which 300,000 people participated. The Communists are cooperating with different forces at all levels and particularly in lower echelons. In the Star March held in Bonn on May 11 against the Emergency Laws and which attracted 70,000 including some 15,000 students, delegations from the big factories participated for the first time

thanks to the initiative of the production councils and trade union officials.

I have already spoken about the worker-student committees. These committees are frequently formed on the initiative of our members. For more than a year now the Party has been campaigning to regain its legal status. Since March 1967 the Legalize-the-Party Initiative Committee has held some 200 meetings in which thousands of students have participated. Our Party has also tried to publicize its draft program legally. The reaction of the Bonn authorities to this is well known. More and more of our members are addressing the youth movement openly as Communists so as to be able openly to answer their questions and direct the movement.

Speaking of the new developments in the youth movement I should like to mention the following. Shortly before the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, an organization of the Socialist working youth was founded in the Ruhr, the first ever since the establishment of the Federal Republic. Although it stresses that it is an organization of the *working* youth, it welcomes all democratic youth.

As I have already mentioned there is a growing interest in socialism and Marxism in the Federal Republic and it was only natural that the young Socialists should want to know more about these. The program of the Socialist Working Youth states that it is an organization which consistently upholds the demands of the youth. Needless to say the Young Communists cooperate on all issues with the Socialist and Democratic forces in this organization. It is interesting that in the month since its foundation it has carried out a number of effective measures, notably in combating neo-nazism. It strives to answer the questions troubling our youth from Marxist

positions, something totally new in the conditions of legal work among the youth.

We, Communists, wish to clarify some of the ideological questions posed by the labor movement. For example, the link between democracy and socialism. We also consider it essential to explain the role of the working class as the leading force. Another question concerns the new forms of struggle and methods of rallying new forces and broadening the existing alliance. The question of spontaneity and consciousness likewise needs to be explained.

In our practical work we shall, now that the dictatorial Emergency Laws have been passed, use every available avenue to combat their implementation and will strive to have them annulled. We will also orient on the movement for participation in the management of industry, of the state and society; and we will intensify our work in the trade unions. Needless to say, for us the fight against neo-nazism and its root causes is of particular importance in view of the Federal Republic's turn to the Right. We think that there is every possibility of establishing new anti-fascist democratic alliances and united fronts in all spheres of our activity.

What Lenin said in 1901 fully applies to the present situation: The student came to the aid of the worker. It is now the turn of the worker to go to the aid of the student. The conclusion is obvious: we must form and develop an alliance of the working class and the intelligentsia, especially today, in the age of the technical revolution.

We must strain every nerve to win, first and foremost, the young people to the ideas of socialism, to the idea of reconstructing our society, for it is they who will be the architects of the future.

WEST BERLIN

All that has been said here about the youth and student movement, said *Bruno Kuster* of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany—West Berlin, applies on the whole also to West Berlin. I will try, without, I hope, repeating what others have said, to say something about the progress of this movement in the special area of West Berlin, which links up with development in other West European countries. In our city this movement appears somewhat magnified, as

if seen through a magnifying glass, West Berlin being a rather small area with a population of just over 2,000,000, including roughly 40,000 students. The struggle here takes place in a limited area where the contradictions between the imperialist and socialist systems manifest themselves directly. West Berlin, a city under imperialist rule, borders on only the socialist German Democratic Republic or, to be precise, is located on GDR soil. A strong-

hold of the big imperialist powers, it comes under the occupation regime of the USA, Britain and France. The city fathers align their policies with those of the West German imperialists, militarists and revenge-seekers.

The contradictions between the two social systems express themselves in a concentrated form in West Berlin. Class antagonisms, too, are particularly acute. Subservience to imperialist policy has practically reduced to nil political, economic and cultural relations with the GDR, the natural surrounding of West Berlin. Things are further complicated by this enclave on GDR territory having no normal political or economic relations with the GDR and, what is more, that Bonn uses it as a base for cold war, enmity and hatred towards the GDR and the other socialist countries. As heretofore, West Berlin remains a thorn in the body of the GDR. The economy, such as it is, is wholly and one-sidedly geared to that of West Germany.

Such then, in rough outline, is the environment in which the democratic movement of youth and students has been developing in West Berlin.

In April this year an attempt was made on the life of the student leader Rudi Dutschke. The act seemed to have been patterned on the assassination of the late Martin Luther King. Horrified by the attempted murder, students, workers and other young people reacted with powerful demonstrations which continued for weeks and were mostly directed against the policy of the West Berlin Senate, primarily against the use of communication media to manipulate public opinion.

A central committee of young workers, school pupils and students was formed the day after the attempt on Dutschke's life. All the active youth organizations in the city were represented on this committee which organized all the demonstrations. These culminated in a powerful united demonstration on May Day in which some 50,000 workers, students, secondary school pupils and others participated. The demonstration was part of the campaign for greater democratic rights, against the policy and practice of emergency legislation followed by the West Berlin Senate and the Bonn government. There were demands for a united front against neo-Nazism, for peace, democracy and social progress. The demonstrators took a stand also against

the U.S. war in Vietnam, for normal political relations with the GDR.

On May 2 the Social-Democratic mayor of the city complained that the Socialist Unity Party-West Berlin had "found a new platform." His statement brought broadsides from the entire capitalist press denouncing the May Day demonstration. UPI news agency commented on the Berlin events as follows:

A spectre has been haunting Europe for the past thirty years—the spectre of Popular Front. Now this Front has materialized in West Berlin. The Springer press, which had denounced the actions of students and young workers as hooliganism to be answered by truncheons and water cannons, suddenly changed course. Young people and students, it now counselled, your claims are justified as a matter of fact, and it would be a good idea to see how the "shortcomings" of our "democracy" can be eliminated and some of your demands met. But there is one thing you must not do—you must not enter into any alliance with the Communists!

The youth movement in West Berlin did not grow overnight. The first clashes between the students and official policy date from 1960, and the movement has been growing ever since. The first serious clashes in 1960 occurred in the student organization of the West Berlin Social-Democrats. The clashes took place over the issue of a realistic policy for West Germany and West Berlin, specifically over the attitude to the GDR. The students wanted recognition of the GDR, and for this the Social-Democratic Party leadership in Bonn expelled the youth organization. But the struggle continued, and it grew with the downturn in the economic situation.

The years of the boom ended in the early sixties also in West Berlin. With the growth of state-monopoly capitalism we witnessed new processes of concentration and rationalization in industry, the closing down of enterprises and their transfer to West Germany, dismissals and wage cuts, crisis phenomena—in other words, the same as in West Germany and in the other capitalist countries. At the same time the West Berlin economy was becoming more and more of an appendage to its West German counterpart. This was because the West Berlin economy was increasingly assuming the function of supplier to the West German corporations.

The arguments which the capitalists and

their apologists had used over the years to mislead the people were no longer persuasive. The "economic miracle" turned out to be plain ordinary capitalism. The nonsense about "social partnership," with capitalists and workers sitting "in the same boat," was exposed. It became clearer still that never again would there be a united imperialist Germany. All this gradually led to a certain sobering and to the birth of new concepts among the working people generally, and particularly among the young people.

In this growing movement of the democratic, socialist and anti-imperialist forces we see an expression of the deepening antagonism between wage and salaried workers and the big monopolies, as an exacerbation of the contradictions between the objective needs of political and social life and the official policy of the West Berlin rulers. Polarization of the classes, and the antagonism between labor and capital made a deep rift in the population and in each of the parties in the West Berlin parliament, especially in the Social Democratic Party. Mayor Schultz, who is also Social Democratic chairman in West Berlin, had to acknowledge that the Social Democrat leaders and supporters were on opposite sides of the barricades. While the Senate implements the policy of the West German monopolies and steps up its policy of cold war and anti-communism, Social Democrat members and supporters take part in the demonstrations against the policy and practice of emergency legislation, against the U.S. war in Vietnam, against reactionary social legislation, for normal business relations with the GDR.

With the polarization came a certain consolidation of the political forces. On the one hand, the rulers of West Berlin and the Senate led by Social Democrats persisted in subordinating the city to the policy of the West German monopolies based on revanchism, on the claim to spokesmanship for all Germans, on the desire to get nuclear arms, the dictatorship of the "state of emergency," reactionary laws and practices. The city fathers gradually shifted to a Right course. The reason why the neo-fascist National Democratic Party managed to make its way on to the political scene in West Berlin was that the Senate, the CDU and the Social-Democrat leadership pursued a policy conducive to such a development. On the other hand, the opposition forces, which are putting

forward a number of democratic demands, are going from strength to strength.

It is in the light of the foregoing that we view the progress of the democratic movement among youth, above all among the students. For us the "rebellion" of the youth and students in our city is an expression of the sharpening class struggle. The youth movement is concerned with problems that affect the entire population. What we see is just a tip of the iceberg. I think it is revealing that the movement has right from the outset been a political campaign, not a clash of the generations.

The reappraisal, especially among the young people, began in 1961 when the GDR took steps to safeguard its frontier with West Berlin and when it became obvious that the plans for undermining the GDR or bringing it under West German imperialist rule had failed. Ever since the demand to recognize the GDR has been gaining momentum.

We must admit that before the Cuban crisis there had been many illusions about the role of U.S. imperialism. Afterwards, the greater part of the population began to have second thoughts. The role of the Soviet Union as a peaceful power and of the United States as an aggressive force became more obvious. The U.S. war in Vietnam, which brought widespread protest from our city, went a long way towards clearing the minds of people and stimulating the youth movement. At first the movement was in the nature of a peace campaign, but the barbarous aggression in Vietnam disclosed the real character of U.S. imperialism. It is not accidental, therefore, that the movement laid increasing emphasis on demands directed against the capitalist system, against imperialism. The violence against fighters for civil rights in the United States, the assassination of President Kennedy, of Martin Luther King and now Robert Kennedy—all played a part in the development. But most important was that the rulers of our city had always identified themselves with the rulers of America. Young people clashed with state power again and again, and these clashes culminated in the killing of the student Benno Ohnesorg by a West Berlin policeman. The result was that the young people began to discern the true nature of the prevailing system.

The dissociation of large groups of young people from the policy of the rulers of West Berlin and West Germany was

prompted, first of all, by the entry of Brandt and his fellow Social-Democrats into the grand coalition with the CDU. These leaders had now become accomplices of the CDU and the West German imperialists. This so disheartened a large section of youth who until then had been under Social-Democratic influence that they joined the opposition.

The demand for a democratic system of secondary and higher education began to gain ground in the student movement and among youth generally. The students, it will be recalled, have a slogan about the educational system in the Federal Republic and West Berlin which reads: "Beneath the academic gowns lies the dust of ages." This is to say that the educational system does not meet the requirements of progress, in particular those of the scientific and technological revolution.

Unlike the higher education in the socialist countries—specifically in the GDR—education here is dominated not by the spirit of collective research but by strictly authoritarian principles which hamper educational progress. The students' criticism is levelled also against the class structure of education which denies to large numbers of young people access to higher education. The Free University in West Berlin, founded by the United States, is known as an institution whose paramount objective is to combat socialism in general and the socialist countries in particular. In this university, which lauds bourgeois freedom and democracy and the American way of life, the students enjoyed complete "freedom" only so long as they sided with the Establishment.

Many young people began to query the genuineness of bourgeois freedom and democracy. For, the moment they began to demonstrate against the U.S. war in Vietnam and against the policy of their rulers, they found themselves in opposition to the authorities, found themselves abused in the capitalist press. Their organizations were prohibited from taking a stand on political issues unrelated to the university. This led them to take action again and again, insisting that their organizations be allowed a role on the political scene.

The whole movement is, in fact, a result of the political and economic evolution of the system of state-monopoly capitalism. In West Berlin, too, there is no denying that workers' children make up only five per cent of the student community. By far

most of the students are the sons and daughters of capitalists, of the bourgeois intelligentsia and others not belonging directly to the industrial working class. However, the development of the state-monopoly system has been accompanied by a change in the attitude of the intelligentsia and other strata, including some sections of the bourgeoisie. The antagonisms have gone deeper here too. They stand out where spiritual problems of today are tackled. The core of student opposition is in the social science and philosophy faculties, and in the institutes of history and journalism. It was here that the movement first developed, and maybe the reason is that the students in these faculties have greater access to political information.

One more thing. What we say about concentration in industry helping the workers to organize applies also, to a certain extent, to the universities. Ideas and movements tend to spread more easily and rapidly where many people are thrown together. Certainly, this explains why the students are the most active factor of the youth movement. After all, Dahlem University has 15,000 students, technical university about 12,000 and teachers' college some 6,000. A word about the attitude of our Party to this movement and the Party's role in it. In West Berlin the movement calls itself the extra-parliamentary opposition. This, I should point out, is not an organization or an institution; it is, strictly speaking, the sum of the most diverse democratic, socialist, anti-imperialist and other opposition forces and organizations.

Our Party sees itself as a contingent of this movement. And, taking part in it, we try to do what the students and the other youth forces cannot do because at the moment they are against everything. Since many of these forces experience difficulty in arriving at constructive measures and ways leading to progress, we see our task in helping them to draw up political programs understandable to all. For example, we have suggested "Democracy and Progress. Neo-Fascism Shall Not Pass," as a platform summing up the demands of the entire movement. We have drafted a program for a democratic reform of secondary and higher education, and have discussed it with students, professors and workers to set the movement a goal and indicate the lines on which the struggle over this issue should be carried on. We have done the same thing with the issue of co-management and intend to offer our program

as an objective in the workers' struggle.

Many forces presently in opposition to capitalism say they want to abolish capitalism. We tell them that we fully agree with them, but that the way to achieve this is gradually to restrict monopoly power, and that political power is essential for full control of production. We make it clear that extensive and competent participation in management by the working people can be brought about only through a steady campaign by them inside and outside parliament, through class struggles.

We, understandably, differ with other forces in the movement over this issue. Some two years ago we extended unreserved support to all that promoted the movement, giving this priority over our own contribution. We backed the movement not only politically and ideologically but in practical terms, stressing that it was a movement of youth and students. To further the movement, we deliberately refrained from stressing our own role. But now, and particularly since the killing of Ohnesorg, our approach has been somewhat different. Needless to say, we stand for the working class playing the leading role in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism. Our principle is that the Party must be politically, ideologically and organizationally independent, and cooperate with all progressive forces regardless of differences in line with this principle.

We make no claim, then, to leadership of the other groups and contingents of the extra-parliamentary opposition. We realize that these forces do not base themselves on Marxism-Leninism. We say that within the framework of the movement each should make his contribution, that is, should cooperate as far as possible in specific and constructive political actions, in struggles and debates on ideological matters. When, for example, Professor Marcuse visited West Berlin where he addressed an audience on his theory of an "elite," his theory to the effect that the students are the revolutionary force of today whereas the working class, being a force integrated into the capitalist system, has no longer a revolutionary potential, we opposed him in principle. We realize that many of the young men and women who find themselves in opposition and are revolutionary-minded make unrealistic demands and suggestions.

Left radical demands are easier than earnest and sustained work among the

masses. The students have had experience of cold war propaganda and anti-communism and their political thinking has been affected by anti-communism. This cannot of course disappear overnight. Student thinking is contradictory, and this makes it easier for certain forces to advance Left radical and pseudo-revolutionary concepts.

We patiently argue with students about what we consider to be erroneous views, try to help them dissociate themselves from extremist radical and reckless ideas and forces. In recent times the extreme radical forces have been largely instrumental for placing themselves in isolation. They have reached this isolation by advancing slogans that have no appeal for the masses. Instead of demanding a change of policy, some proclaim, for example, "All power to soviets." Or else they describe the state of affairs in West Berlin as a revolutionary situation. These and similar notions, which ignore the actual conditions and the present level of the mass movement, naturally evoke little or no response among the rest of the people, the workers included, and lead to isolation. It should be noted that political and ideological ground already covered in previous stages of the revolutionary working-class movement has to be covered all over again. "*Left-Wing*" Communism: an Infantile Disorder may be said to be a textbook for many West Berliners today. There is talk about autonomy for the masses. Some reject all authority, others reject democratic centralism, the basis of proletarian struggle. We consider it necessary to wage an earnest ideological fight on these issues in order to win over the reasonable and to isolate those away in the extreme left.

However, we are not putting these issues first. With us priority goes to the task of forming a democratic united front on a broad basis against the policy of the West Berlin rulers, for a new foreign policy for West Berlin, especially towards the GDR, against the U.S. war in Vietnam, for satisfaction of social demands and against encroachments on social rights, for safeguarding and extending democratic rights and freedoms in the country, against the policy and practice of emergency legislation.

We are making a steady and practical effort to promote cooperation in these issues while upholding our stand on the ideological differences. The primary task, as we see it, is to combine the student

and youth movement with the workers' movement in the trade unions and the enterprises.

We can make headway only if we suc-

ceed in forming a broad democratic united front of youth, students and workers with a view to curbing monopoly rule also in West Berlin.

UNITED STATES

Matthew Hallinan (CP USA) began his speech by describing some of the background that helps to explain the general youth upsurge in the United States. This is varied and complex. This generation of young Americans, that is people under the age, say, of 25, has had an experience which distinguishes it from all previous generations of young people in America. For this generation has grown up in a world in which imperialism is no longer the dominant force. That is not something abstract, for the growing influence of socialism and anti-imperialism have affected the minds of young people in America in very concrete and specific ways.

Moreover this generation has grown up at a time when the beginnings of a shift could be discerned in the policy of the dominant sections of American imperialism itself; with the loss of its atomic monopoly, and with the growing consolidation of the socialist world the dominant circles of American capitalism themselves had to begin to make an accommodation to the new power relationships in the world.

What that signified was a reversal in the more strident, aggressive, hysterical anti-communist approach that had characterized the cold war phase in the United States during the McCarthy period, from 1947 up to about 1956. This generation, fortunately, did not have that hysterical experience of the older people in America. Likewise the consistent struggle for peace by the socialist camp had gained greater understanding among the American people, and the consistent shift in mass attitudes was reflected in the polls starting from about 1956-58. Increasingly, the sentiment of the American people for peace brought them not into conflict with the socialist world but rather into conflict with the policies of their own government. Recall, for example, the reaction to the provocations against the Soviet Union, the U2 incident, provocations in Germany, the Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba, then the missile crisis in Cuba, the Santo Domingo intervention and, eventually, the massive escalation in Vietnam. All this, running contrary to the peace

sentiment of the American people, led more and more to a confrontation with the policy of their own government.

Another effect was the impetus given to the struggle for Negro freedom by the fight of the peoples struggling for national liberation.

This civil rights struggle has had a profound effect upon the young generation. No longer was this generation schooled with textbooks nakedly racist as in previous years. No longer did they see films and TV programs which were openly and viciously racist.

These young people had the unique experience of witnessing and participating in a massive and successful movement organized and led by the black people themselves. Their identification with the masses of black people and their leaders deepened the consciousness of the young white people. This lessening of racism among this generation of young whites is a most important thing in our country, for it is racism, this division of black and white, which historically has destroyed and paralyzed every major democratic and radical movement in our country.

These, I think, are some of the experiences of this generation that have helped in shaping a frame of mind that is, in fact, unique. But, these experiences, important though they are, do not suffice to explain the upsurge among the young people in our country. The key factor here which, of course, derives from the developments generally in the world, is the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism reflected perhaps most clearly in the declining fortunes of U.S. imperialism in particular. Today we find the reappearance of crisis phenomena in American capitalism. With the reappearance of economic difficulties we find the adoption by the ruling circles of a program to intensify state-monopoly measures with a view to coping with the increasing economic difficulties. In fact, we find an intensification of state-monopoly measures taking place with the Kennedy administration and being further expanded throughout the Johnson period.

These include the huge increase in military expenditure even previous to the war in Vietnam, with rapidly rising taxation and growing inflation.

The total effect has been to cut deeply into the standard of living. What is so important about these developments is that the burden of the new state-monopoly measures has not fallen evenly on the mass of the people. The cost of capitalist decline has been borne chiefly by certain sections of the people, particularly the Negro people and the youth.

America along with most capitalist countries shared in the postwar population explosion. By 1970, in the United States one-half of the population will be under 25 years. One of every four workers will be from this age group. But this population growth has taken place at a time of growing stagnation in the economy. The rate of unemployment for all sections of the population in the United States is about four per cent. For those in the age groups of from 16 to 24 years unemployment is 12 per cent for young white people, and from 24 to 30 per cent for young black people. Young people make up 12 per cent of the work force, but 33 per cent of the unemployed. Even with the war in Vietnam which has brought around three million young people into the Armed Services, unemployment for young people remains the same.

Thus large numbers of young Americans are of the age to enter the economy at a moment when the latter is slowing down. Then there is the uneven distribution of young people in particular sectors of the economy. Young people are forced to move into the most unfavorable, low-paid jobs. In particular, they find employment in the non-union, unorganized sweatshops, in those industries which move out of the union areas into the more backward unorganized areas. And even in the unions there are difficulties for young people. American industry tries to compensate for the decline in profits, caused in part by the relatively high wages of the organized workers, through a tremendous intensification of labor, by what we call speed-up.

The effects of speedup are being widely felt among the working people, with a growth in chronic ailments and nervous disorders. Again it is the young workers who suffer most from these intensified labor practices. Even in the organized industries the young workers are found in

those job categories in which the labor is strenuous and intensive.

In heavy industry the unions have a 90-day waiting period before a young worker can acquire union membership and job security. For 90 days he is without union protection. Should he be involved in militant union activity or any political activity he will be released from his job. It is now the policy of the big corporations to maintain 15 per cent of their work force in these conditions. And the unions have not adequately combated this form of division perpetrated by the corporations.

The unions, unfortunately, do little to meet the cultural needs of the young workers. They have hardly any voice in union matters. The total effect is a growing alienation between the young people, the young workers in the shops and the trade unions. This situation has opened up all kinds of opportunities for the bourgeoisie to divide the working class movement. We see it as particularly crucial for our party to begin to organize the young workers into independent forms within the unions so that they can begin to bring union policy more into line with their needs. Last year was a record for strikes in our country. And the strikes, it should be said, were to a great extent sparked off by young workers. In fact we see a new phenomenon in our country, namely, illegal strikes and the rejection of contracts already signed by the union leadership. These strikes, too, and these rejections have been led mainly by young people now entering industry.

In the United States, the current Federal Budget is over \$186 billion, \$80 billion of this goes for military outlays and a large sum in payment of interest on the national debt. The United States, often described as a welfare state, is nothing of the sort. Taxes paid by people characterized by our government as economically deprived and poverty stricken could pay for the entire outlay by the Federal Government on public health, education and welfare. Recent attempts by the administration, and they will probably be successful, to further cut social welfare expenditure and to couple this cut with a ten per cent surcharge tax increase, and to further reduce corporate taxes in order to stimulate investment, is merely one more step along the path followed since the end of World War II. Along with the rising Federal taxes there is a burgeoning state and local tax system. Today it is estimated that one-third of the

wages of working people go into taxes and almost none of this comes back in terms of social services.

In fact the decline in the social services, the decay of our cities and our public facilities, is now a matter of public concern. And again it is the young who suffer most from this. The inadequacy of educational facilities, of teachers, of playground and recreational facilities, is really serious. Indeed, the decline in the health and physical standards of American youth is such that in order to recruit soldiers for the war in Vietnam the government has had to revise the standards of physical fitness.

Then there is the fearful housing shortage, a shortage felt particularly by young couples setting out on married life, by the young black people.

A word or two about the military crisis of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. Perhaps no other event has so turned the people against the government as the war in Vietnam. There is a massive awareness that the present government does not represent the mass of the people, that it acts on behalf of an interest that is alien to them. Young people are repelled by the ghastly brutality that our rulers have brought to Vietnam. They have been shocked by the horror of the genocide that their government is pursuing there. Even young people who do not fully grasp the role of U.S. imperialism, who do not clearly see all the issues in Vietnam, have been repelled by the government's policy. Vietnam has literally transformed the mass of the young people in America. The result is that in every major arena of struggle their conditions are such that they initiate activity and display a militancy and readiness to struggle that is often lacking among other sections of the population.

About our student problems. There are in America some five million students in higher education. The working class composition of these students is much higher than it is in Europe. By working class, however, I have in mind its upper strata—technicians, the professional workers, and the white collar workers. True a sizeable section of our student population is composed of the sons and daughters of industrial workers. The crisis in higher education and the student movement that expresses this crisis is a direct result of the growth of state-monopoly capitalism. Indeed, the rapid growth in the numbers of students reflects the technical revolution which is taking place in the economy.

However, while monopoly needs new technicians, it wants to shift the cost of their training onto the working class, and to the students themselves. Tuition costs in the United States are steadily rising. There has been a relative decline in the funds granted by the Federal Government, and an increased reliance upon local and state taxes to help pay for education. In our country, local and state taxes are, in the main, property and consumer taxes. This has led to the burden of education being borne by the students who pay the tuition and by the working people who pay the taxes. There is tremendous overcrowding and inadequate facilities on every campus, so much so that many of our educational facilities are used 16 hours a day.

Then there is what we call academic speed-up, very similar to the speed-up in industry. Students are rushed through colleges to make way for new students. The study is arduous, leaving little time for reflection or creative thought. But this is not the only problem the students face. There is no force in the world more arrogant than American monopoly capitalism. Not only do the monopolies refuse to pay the cost of education, they are primarily responsible for the rising costs. Finance capital has moved into the education business in a big way. For example, the text book industry, the manufacture of electronic teaching devices and the new teaching equipment are controlled by a few powerful corporations. The giant real estate and banking firms have moved in to buy up the housing and recreational facilities for the students. Rent and the cost of living for university students are incredibly high.

Monopoly capitalism has taken control of the Board of Governors in every major university.

Let me give one or two examples. The chairman of the Governing Board of the University of California is the president of the Bank of America, the largest financial institution on the West Coast. Other Board members are drawn from the big monopoly agricultural and industrial interests in the state, still others come from the mass communications industry, press, radio and television. The unrest at Berkeley began when the university moved to ban demonstrations led by students in protest against racial discrimination in one of the major newspapers. It was not until the university moved against the students that the students discovered that the publisher

of the paper, a local reactionary, was a member of the Board of Governors of their own university.

The President of Columbia University is one Grayson Kirk. Kirk is an ex-Chairman of the Standard Oil Company of New York. Sitting with him on the Board of Governors are representatives of Rockefeller dominated corporations such as the Chase Manhattan Bank, and representatives of the First National City Bank, the other main monopoly financial complex in New York City.

The student crisis which developed at Columbia grew out of the struggle on two issues. One involved the expansion of the university into a nearby Negro ghetto, destroying the homes of these people and building university facilities in that area. The other issue was to try and get the university to end its military research program. The corporations represented on the Board are the largest landowning corporations in the City of New York and they were using the university to get rid of low-rent housing and to replace it with more expensive and valuable facilities. The First National City Bank, together with some of the Rockefeller corporations, constitutes the biggest bloc of military contractors in the United States. The University was simply acting as a large holding company for these corporate interests. Small wonder then that, in the main, the student protest posed the relationship between their universities and the war in Vietnam and the Negro oppression at home.

The universities, the main arenas for military research, are increasing the involvement of their facilities directly in the cold war, particularly in relation to the government policy of so called counter insurgency. The strategic hamlet program, used by our government in Vietnam, was drawn up by a group of social scientists working for the Michigan State University. Another university has just sent a team of anthropologists to interview peasants in Vietnam, to discover which category of peasants is most involved in the revolution. Their first findings show that the middle peasant was most revolutionary. This led to the conclusion that land reform, far from staving off revolution, brought it on. This is seen as a lesson for South America. Also notorious in this regard was Operation Camelot, run by anthropologists from the University of Pittsburgh. This was a research project to accumulate material that would provide the strategy for counter-

insurgency tactics in Latin American countries. One could also cite the concentration on what is called industrial psychology. Essentially, the purpose is to find out why workers resist the intensification of labor, and how to circumvent the resistance. Students, increasingly becoming proletarianized, are forced to act in the interest of the ruling class. Masses of students are being forced down to the level of the working class. They form the bulk of the new "technological proletariat." The technological revolution is bringing to an end the existence of an independent middle class in the United States. For lawyers, doctors, technicians, business administrators, teachers and professors the future is that of a wage-earner. The students are beginning to realize that capitalism cannot provide conditions for the development of their potentialities as human beings. In fact their development in the academic world is not associated with the advancement of knowledge or with the good of mankind, but rather with the advancement of corporate interests. And so growing numbers of students are beginning to see their problem not just one of university reform; as they put it, "you cannot free the university without freeing society." A socialist consciousness is making headway among our students.

The radicalization of the young people and the students in particular has taken place in the absence of the mass working class upsurge and in conditions in which the organized working class is dominated by a cold war and collaborationist leadership. This, coupled with the composition of the student movement, its background, its way of life, is fertile soil for the growth of various petty bourgeois revolutionary philosophies. The problem is intensified because of the vital role that students play in every movement today. In addition to leading the student and campus movement, they play a vital role in the peace movement and in the movement for Black liberation. Their ideas have spilled over to every center of the youth, including those involved in trade union and working class struggles. The ideological problems of the students are not theirs alone. Because the students have attempted to activate and organize the masses, they have carried their ideas to large numbers of people.

The ideology of the so-called New Left grows out of the recognition of the technical and human possibilities of modern industrial society. The representatives of this

trend see that the present form of social organization will not allow for the flowering and realization of these possibilities. Thus, it is a rebellion that operates within the framework of a bourgeois world view. Essentially, this is the world view of the middle class which has no future in capitalism, which feels betrayed by the promises of bourgeois freedom and liberty and which sees for itself a future of wage-slavery. But it is built also upon a concept of the invincibility of American capitalism. American capitalism, it maintains, has transcended its internal contradictions. The struggle of the working people, the class struggle, leads, according to this view, to the strengthening of capitalism. The only contradiction is between man's essential human freedom and the reality of his non-free existence in society.

It is a philosophy designed to divert people from class struggle. Needless to say, many of the solutions it offers are the hoary utopian solutions long ago rejected by the working-class movement. But one of the problems of the young is that being young they have no great sense of history.

A few words concerning the direction in which we are trying to work. First, no matter what the petty-bourgeois prejudices of the students may be they recognize the necessity of allies. They are moving towards relationships with the working class and with the Black people. They do not understand as yet the basis of unity between themselves and these forces, do not realize that they must join in the struggles of the workers and not attempt merely to recruit them to their own utopian schemes. But they are learning. In this context there is a growing respect for Marxist theory in our country.

We are beginning to have some success. But the main thrust of our political strategy for youth work is to bring working class youth into the active leadership of the youth movement.

Now perhaps you can see why we in the United States cannot make a distinction between the student movement and the mass youth movement in general. In practice both are bound up with one another and it is not possible for us to organize the

masses of working-class youth without at the same time winning over great numbers of the student youth who are following the same objective, that is, they too are trying to organize the working class youth. To do this we have begun to experiment with new forms of organization.

We are in the process of building a Marxist youth organization composed of Communists and non-Communists, students, workers and Black youth. We have begun now to organize young trade-unionists into this Marxist organization and they have begun to take the initiative in organizing the unorganized. This has attracted large sections of the student Left to this organization and they are anxious to participate with us in this organizing drive. They have begun to change their attitude towards the workers and their problems, to appreciate their militancy. We are also building this Marxist youth organization among the Black youth in the ghettos. At the moment, this organization is the sole organization on the American Left which has both Black and White youth.

To conclude, I would like to enumerate a few points that we could perhaps discuss later on.

To begin with, I think that the change in the world balance of forces has created a massive shift to the Left among the petty-bourgeoisie. The struggle for working-class ideology, for Marxism-Leninism, must be taken to a new level. Those sections which are becoming working class and objectively anti-capitalist, will not be of aid to the working-class movement until they begin to understand their stake in the movement. We believe that there should be exchanges between the parties as to how they handle the ideological problems of their youth and student youth in particular. We also would like to see discussed a general strategy of youth work and the relationship between the students and other sections of the youth, as well as new organizational forms for youth. We mean here, concretely, relationships between the Communist youth and the masses of youth moving towards socialism in the advanced capitalist countries. And, lastly, we would like some discussion on the question of structural reform for the university.

(A summary of the discussion will appear in our next issue.)

Imperialist war policy and unity of the world communist movement

WITOLD JAROSINSKI

The social determinism of military conflicts has always been a major element of the Marxist-Leninist approach to the problem of war. Wars take place only under specific social relations—that should be the starting point of any comprehensive, philosophical understanding of the theory of war. Marxism has consistently opposed the traditional, but still current, contention that war is a “normal,” or at any rate inevitable, phenomenon of the human existence. It holds that war is always the product of a specific system of social relations. It is not — and this Marxism has proved — a structural, inalienable element of human society, but rather an historical phenomenon, though war has been a concomitant of civilized society ever since its inception. Wars are caused by specific social factors, the removal of which would make it possible to banish war from the life of society.

The sources of military conflicts lie in private ownership of the means of production and in the corresponding social relations, which breed antagonism between classes and nations. War is an expression of these antagonisms. Though class interests and conflicts are the roots causes of war, the immediate causes should be sought in concrete conflicts of interest, concrete contradictions that are part of a definite period or phase of international relations. All too often they are camouflaged, for propaganda purposes, by imaginary causes and imaginary motivations.

The concept of the social and class origins of war enabled Marx to indicate how it could be eliminated. “For genuine unity, the peoples must have common in-

terests,” he wrote. “And if there are to be common interests, existing property relations must be destroyed, for they make for the exploitation of some peoples by others . . . The victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie signifies the elimination of all national and industrial conflicts, which now breed enmity between peoples.”

But socialist victory only in some countries does not remove the menace of war. It can be removed only with the abolition throughout the world of the social system based on private property and exploitation. Until then the existence in a large part of the world of antagonistic class societies and class policies can, in specific situations, exert an adverse influence even on relations between individual socialist countries.

Abolition of private property and of antagonistic classes does not automatically remove all contradictions between nations. They can be removed only if there is a proper material base, namely, a high level of socialist productive forces capable of satisfying the needs of all nations. For with a low level of productive forces, and given a specific political conjuncture, the old antagonism and enmity might reappear. Marx foresaw that when he wrote that without a powerful expansion of the productive forces, even with the victory of the socialist revolution, the result would be universal poverty; “and with *extreme poverty* the struggle for bare essentials would inevitably revive and with it all the old abomination.”

The fact that the socialist revolution took place in what were formerly economically backward countries influences, in

specific political circumstances, both their home policy and their relations with other, developed socialist countries (the Chinese People's Republic is one example). The present situation requires that we be guided by the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin and combine theory and practice in organizing a united world anti-imperialist front. The effort for peace, the fight to compel the imperialists to stop their aggression, demands that we carefully analyze the record of recent years, and in this, too, we should be guided by Marxism-Leninism, for it assimilates everything that is new and valuable in our experience.

What conclusions can be drawn from that experience?

It should be perfectly clear that international tension, fomented by the U.S. imperialists and their allies, has increased. But this does not diminish the possibilities and scope of our activity. That is the chief conclusion, and it follows that we must skillfully utilize all available opportunities to intensify action against the war menace and imperialist aggression.

The economic achievements of the socialist countries are an important factor in our movement. They directly influence their defense capacity and make it possible to build up a common defense deterrent to imperialist aggression. By strengthening the defense capacity of the socialist countries and their fraternal ties with the Soviet Union through the Warsaw Treaty organization, we will be helping the peace forces and creating realistic prerequisites for the preservation of world peace. Imperialism is doomed to defeat in peaceful competition with the socialist camp, which has far surpassed it in ability to mobilize the energy of the masses, achieve higher economic growth rates and find effective solutions for all social problems. In an attempt to save what can no longer be saved, to halt the march of history, imperialism is prepared to stoop to the most heinous crime of all, global war.

That growing U.S. imperialist aggressiveness has not succeeded in embroiling the peoples in a world conflict is due, in large measure, to the peace policy and growing strength of the socialist world system, notably the defense capacity of the Soviet Union and the action of the revolutionary and democratic forces in many capitalist and developing countries. The enhanced economic, scientific, technical and defense potential of the Soviet Union and of the socialist system as a whole has the effect

of foiling imperialist war preparation.

American strategy in the fight against socialism and the national-liberation movement has long since been based on local wars. Though they heighten the danger of a world conflict, they are indicative of imperialism's weakness. They expose the barbarity of imperialism, but they also show that imperialism cannot achieve its objectives through local wars. That is the second important conclusion.

The people of Vietnam, supported by the socialist countries and by world public opinion, are victoriously resisting America's powerful war machine. Despite arrogant boasting by the Israeli aggressors, it is becoming obvious that they cannot hold on to the Arab territories captured as a result of their treacherous attack. The resistance movement in the occupied areas, the widespread condemnation of the aggressor and the attitude of the socialist countries, will, in the end, compel the Israeli aggressor to retreat.

Ranged against imperialism are tremendous social forces in the capitalist and developing countries. And the main task of the Communist movement is to use this wave of public indignation and protest against imperialist war, particularly in Vietnam and the Middle East, to rally public opinion against imperialism. Local wars are caused by factors intrinsic to the capitalist system. Criticism of imperialism and exposure of the real motives behind its action are an effective way of converting public indignation into a force directed against the root causes of war.

II.

The split in the world Communist movement helps the imperialists pursue their aggressive policies. Consequently, unity of all progressive forces in an anti-imperialist front is an essential condition for effective effort for peace. And here the main task falls to the Communist and Workers' parties, united on a common ideological platform, Marxism-Leninism.

The forces of imperialism and reaction, dominated and led by the United States, are working in concert to implement their global strategy against socialism and the national-liberation movement. That must be countered by a joint strategy of the socialist countries and coordinated action of all the revolutionary, democratic and national-liberation movements.

In the fifty years since the first socialist

revolution, the Communist movement has drawn its strength chiefly from the international solidarity and joint action of the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces. This is what the enemies of socialism fear most and have made it the chief target of their attacks.

The Communist movement has, more or less successfully, changed the aims and methods of united action to accord with the requirements of given situations.

In its initial phase, particularly during the maturing revolutionary storms in Europe after World War I, the Communist International acted as a centralized world organization giving leadership to the movement.

But as the movement grew and matured it was able to conduct the struggle independently, in accordance with the specific conditions in each country. During World War II the Communist parties independently solved the difficult problems involved in the anti-fascist national and revolutionary liberation struggle. The central international organization became anachronistic and was abolished. Far from weakening the movement, this helped to strengthen it in many countries. Unity and solidarity of the revolutionary forces was forged on the battlefields and in the guerrilla units, and later in joint action against fascism and imperialist reaction, and through fraternal aid to the new socialist countries, the working-class and national-liberation movements, which were spreading to new areas.

Repeated attempts after World War II to direct the international Communist movement from a single center proved ineffectual.

In the past ten years, with the new socialist countries having grown stronger, with socialism extending to a third of the world's population, and with the Communist parties—working under diverse conditions and in practically every country—having become a cardinal factor of world affairs, international meetings and conferences became an integral part of the Communist movement.

These conferences provide a forum best suited to present conditions for an exchange of views and coordination of anti-imperialist strategy on the basis of common interests and aims, internationalism and respect for the independence of each participating party.

The conferences do not presuppose unity on all issues; indeed, that would be unrealistic. Though socialism, while spreading

to new countries and areas, retains its unitary class and social substance, in each country it assumes concrete national forms that stem from historically formed conditions. Similarly, Communist parties determine their aims in conformity with national social and political conditions. Differing conditions and experience can lead to divergent views on tactics and national paths to socialism, but this should not prejudice the need for, and the opportunities of joint struggle against our common adversary, world imperialism and its policy of aggression and war. More, though differing from country to country, the policies of the Communist parties must be based on far-reaching unity on international policy, for all Communist and Workers' parties have common aims and interests. In the final analysis, the success of each Party depends, more than ever before, on the outcome of the world struggle of socialism and imperialism. Besides, in formulating a common strategy against imperialism, and in working out practical forms of united socialist action, what unites the parties is incomparably more important than their present differences. The fight against imperialism and its aggressive wars is a task common to all parties.

Differences in views on the ways of building socialism and the methods of struggle for power should not be an obstacle to concerting communist efforts in the battle against imperialism.

Of course, the Communists want the broadest possible cooperation with all anti-imperialist forces, based on the principles of equality. But we believe that the Communists must first work out their own joint policy of anti-imperialist struggle.

Participation in international forums cannot restrict the independence of any Party or impose upon it decisions with which it does not agree. Nor can an international conference discuss the policy of one or another Party, let alone condemn a party. The Communiqué of the Consultative Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in February-March 1968 contains this passage: "The Consultative Meeting believes that the purpose of the Conference will be to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement, to help rally all the forces of socialism and democracy in the struggle against imperialism, for the national and social liberation of the peoples and for peace throughout the world. After discussing proposals for the agenda, the meeting decided that there should be only one

item on the agenda: the tasks of the struggle against imperialism at the present stage and the unity of action of Communist and Workers' Parties, and of all anti-imperialist forces."

Each Communist and Workers' Party is responsible to its working class and to its people. Each Party represents the interests and strivings of its country and independently determines its policy. However, these interests and strivings, as expressed in Party policy, should not be seen in isolation, still less in contradiction to the aims of international socialism. The national tasks of the working people cannot be divorced from their international tasks. The fight waged by each Party is determined not only by the alignment of political forces at home, but also by the international alignment of forces, the confrontation of the two systems and the tense, multiform and all-embracing competition and struggle between socialism and capitalism.

And no differences over tactics, or over methods of building socialism, can justify shirking international responsibility, or retreat into nationalism. Nationalism is the chief menace to the unity, combatability and ideological strength of the Communist movement. Consequently, the fight against nationalism, which is incompatible with the Marxist-Leninist ideology, is an essential pre-condition for the unity of the world Communist movement and consolidation of the international forces of socialism.

Addressing the jubilee meeting in Moscow on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade Wladislaw Gomulka said: "The differences of views among some Communist parties on the methods of fighting for socialism and even on the prospects for the development of the international situation cannot and must not jeopardize what is most important — their international unity in the struggle against imperialism . . . Today, when the intensified arms race increases the threat to peace, when imperialism is undertaking steps to check the liberation movement of the peoples by means of local wars, international united action by all the forces of socialism is imperative, since it is dictated by both the international and national tasks of each Communist Party.

"The Polish United Workers' Party favors the convening of a new conference of Communist and Workers' Parties. We are convinced that such a conference would

contribute to the consolidation of all anti-imperialist forces in the fight for the freedom of the peoples, for democracy, peace and socialism."

Imperialist aggressiveness remains the chief source of international tension and the chief menace to peace. Local wars in various parts of the world can become the starting point of a global conflagration. The United States, the bastion of imperialist aggression, has not abandoned its drive for world supremacy. It is out to police the world for imperialism. Its most loyal ally in Europe is the Federal Republic of Germany. Its government persists in the old policy of boundary revision under a new signboard. Advocacy of hate and revenge against the socialist countries is widespread in the FRG and there is a growing neo-nazism exemplified, in particular, by the recent elections in Baden-Wuerttemberg.

Bonn policy is spearheaded against the first German workers' and peasants' state, the German Democratic Republic. It wants to isolate it from its natural socialist allies in order to re-unite Germany along imperialist lines. That is the dream of madmen, but it makes it all the more necessary for the socialist countries to present a solid united front on the German issue. Considering all these problems, it is highly important to work out a joint appraisal of the world situation and the alignment of forces, a joint international policy that will enable the Communist movement to maximize the efforts of all the forces of socialism, progress and peace to curb imperialist aggression.

Defense of peace is closely related to another key issue, namely, the struggle of the Third World countries to win full independence and sovereignty, overcome economic backwardness, that evil legacy of colonialism, and break out of the neo-colonial dependence which imperialism is trying to impose on Afro-Asian and Latin American countries.

With the new correlation of forces resulting from the rise and dynamic development of the socialist system, the national-liberation movement of 1945-60 led to the decline of colonialism and the emergence of many new national states. Most of them were weak economically and culturally backward. And today, too, they lack trained people and, in many respects, are still dependent on the leading imperialist powers. They have to contend with formidable difficulties and with the constant me-

nance of neo-colonialism, emanating chiefly from the United States.

Though colonial dependence has been abolished, the under-developed nations are still exploited by the international monopolies and the gap between them and the industrial capitalist powers is widening from year to year. The contradiction between the chief capitalist powers, accounting for a third of the capitalist world's population and appropriating four-fifths of its income, and the other, exploited countries, steeped in backwardness and poverty, is being steadily aggravated without any hope of a solution within the framework of the old social system. More and more imperialism resorts to force to keep these countries in subjection, arrogantly interferes in their internal affairs and uses every conceivable method to impose its will on them.

In a number of developing countries we see a sharpening of internal social contradictions between the progressive, consistent patriotic forces and the reactionaries who, animated entirely by selfish class interests, are prepared to make a deal with the imperialists or even collaborate with them. This aggravation of the struggle has resulted in frequent and prolonged political crises and armed clashes.

The national-liberation movement and the patriotic forces in these young states are coming to realize that cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is a weighty factor in their advance to genuine sovereignty, in combating neo-colonialism and assuring free economic and cultural development. There is also a growing realization of the role played by the anti-imperialist struggle of the proletariat and other sections of the working people in the capitalist countries in supporting the national and social liberation of the Third World.

And in this context much depends on the aid accorded the national-liberation and anti-neo-colonialist movement by the socialist camp. Important, too, is the role of the Communists who are in the van of the struggle for the independence and progress of these young nations. The voice of the Communist and Workers' parties at the forthcoming international conference will meet with a response from hundreds of millions in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The knowledge that the Communists, once they unite their forces internationally, can fulfil their mission in the struggle for peace and freedom, is always an inspiration in all our work.

Parties of action

LEON BOR

A torrent of bourgeois literature has been directed against communism and the Communist parties. Disquisitions about the "crisis of communism" have given way to more specific attacks on the Marxist-Leninist parties, their activities, structure and organization. The main lines of argument are easily discernible. There is the contention, for instance, that the Communist parties are not developing because they dogmatically cling to obsolete principles. The proof adduced is the "conservatism" of the parties, their inability to assimilate the new. When parties draw up new programs, elaborate new tactics, their bourgeois critics denounce this as a "retreat from Marxism-Leninism," "renunciation of the revolutionary ideals," etc. All communist activities are unlawful (runs another argument) inasmuch as the Communist Party has no place in the modern capitalist state. But when a Communist party in a capitalist country initiates something constructive this, too, is denounced as "integration in the capitalist system."

The propaganda is differentiated and is not without its repercussions. All the more necessary, therefore, for Marxist-Leninists to examine the problems of Communist party development at the present stage.

I.

Fulfilment of the working class mission in history is closely associated with its degree of organization and the role of its political party. The need for an independent proletarian party arose at the very dawn of the labor movement. The essentials of such a party were theoretically worked out by Marx and Engels more than a century ago; later they were comprehensively elaborated by Lenin. Nevertheless, the party and its problems have time and again become the subject of controversy. Problems which, it would seem, had long since been solved reappear in a new light.

This is easily explained. For the party is not merely a part of the labor movement—it is its vanguard, that is, the part which, thanks to its class consciousness, theoretical equipment and organization, is in a position powerfully to influence the movement's orientation and progress. Focussed in the party's activity are all the currents and

aspects of the class struggle. And in the course of the struggle the party becomes the brain, the central nervous system, which coordinates and directs the separate efforts of the movement.

But the party is not an ossified organism, is not tied to a set pattern. It develops together with the labor movement and modifies its organization and practical work to conform with the constantly changing conditions.

Long years of struggle have shown that, in all circumstances, including present-day circumstances, the relationship between the subjective and objective factors of the movement is central to all party work. The problem, whether clearly formulated or not, is ever present: should the party actively influence reality in order to change it, or should it adapt itself to reality and patiently wait for things to change of their own volition.

The record shows that opportunism, in all its varieties including the modern one,

seeks to restrict to a minimum working-class revolutionary action to influence social development. Capitalism, the opportunists argue, is gradually moving in the direction of socialism, and nothing the working class can do will hasten the process. The opportunists minimize the role of the proletarian political organization, the role of the vanguard, and avoid alliance with it. Yielding to the ideological and economic influence of the bourgeoisie—to which they are closely tied—they shy away from united working-class action or exploit it to further their own aims.

However, now as in the past, the labor movement has to contend not only with Right-wing opportunism. The danger comes also from the “Left”—from the revolutionaries of sentiment and mood, men for whom impatience becomes a guiding principle. For them the revolutionary phrase is a substitute for analysis of reality and the opportunities it offers for action.

Curiously, these extremes, these mutually-opposed attitudes, merge in denying the leading role of the party, which they would replace by some other type of organization.

There is the evidence of experience to show that all attempts to abolish the party were in one or another way linked with excessive emphasis on a particular form of struggle and its imposition on the movement, in total disregard of its multiformity.

The trend known as economism, for example, the initial opportunistic trend in the Russian labor movement, reduced the workers’ struggle to gaining economic concessions. This narrowed the outlook of the movement to purely craft interests. The followers of economism, naturally, did not need a political party; in fact, they opposed its foundation, arguing that what the working class needed most were mutual benefit societies. . . .

Anarcho-syndicalism, too, is wholly opposed to political parties. Instead it advocates “direct democracy” and the mass strike as practically the only working-class weapon, and one, moreover, that will resolve all social antagonisms.

We know of the fate of some Social-Democratic parties for whom parliament and the ballot box were everything. For all practical purposes, these parties lost all semblance of militant labor organizations. We know, too, the harm done by the revisionist theory that modern capitalism rules out militant forms of struggle, and that the working-class party can therefore be replaced by associations, unions, or

political clubs. True, the Marxist party cannot, and should not evade discussion, both in its own ranks and, more especially, with groups it wants to win over. But the party should not degenerate into a mere debating society.

Opportunists, both of the Right and the Left, have little use for a political party. The former because they reject revolutionary forms of struggle, the latter because they accept only extreme, armed forms of struggle and maintain that the party can be replaced by guerrilla detachments or insurgent units.

It should not be difficult to see that this orientation on one particular form of struggle with its denial of the role of the party inevitably leads to denial of mass action. In a number of countries the Left extremists reject the very idea of mass movements and mass methods and forms of struggle. The Right opportunists, on the other hand, advocate methods calculated to keep the masses in a state of passivity, and always try to direct mass movements towards issues that have no substantive effect on the capitalist system. Fear of mass action leads to fear of an active revolutionary party capable of employing every method and means to bring the masses into motion.

And so, despite the wide difference in conceptual positions, the opportunists and Left extremists have one thing in common—denial of the party’s vanguard role. Yet all past experience shows—and this can be taken as an objective law—that the greater the scope and complexity of the movement, the greater is the need for higher standards of consciousness, theory, policy and organization. These, in fact, are the elements that go into the making of an active working-class party.

Lenin criticized attempts to reduce the movement to one particular form. “Every popular movement,” he wrote, “assumes an infinite variety of forms, is constantly developing new forms and discarding the old, and effecting modifications or new combinations of old and new forms. It is our duty to participate actively in this process of working out means and methods of struggle.”

There is also this distinguishing feature of party activity, as understood by Marxism-Leninism: the role of the party, the objective need for its leadership of the movement, increases with the intensity and complexity of the struggle. This does not, of course, detract from the role and activity

of other organizations. A party with no deep roots in urban and rural communities, no influence in the trade unions, no support among the youth, and no ties with other mass organizations is doomed to remain a sectarian group or, at best, a purely propaganda organization. A party with supporters on every sector of the front can more successfully pursue the aims of the movement, give it ideas and orientation.

Trade unions in the developed capitalist countries now play a much bigger part and their work is acquiring many new features. The reality of state-monopoly capitalism impels them to demand worker participation in industry, both at factory and higher levels. The workers are finding it necessary to demand a bigger say on working conditions and on a wide range of problems posed by the technological revolution. Such demands are an essential part of the fight for better living standards, full employment and a bigger share in national affairs. Even bourgeois ideologists realize that participation in management and guaranteed trade union rights are key issues in one of the greatest social struggles of our age. But the pundits of capitalism console themselves with the thought that this enhanced activity by the trade unions, which are non-political organizations, is part of the trend towards 'depolitization' of the labor movement.

That view has no basis in reality. For the character of the class struggle in a state-monopoly capitalist society is such that the trade unions, conceived as purely economic organizations, are obliged to advance socio-economic demands, to take up political issues, etc. A new, political dimension has been added to trade union work, but this in no way belittles the role of the Communist Party as the political organization of the working class.

The labor and democratic movement should be seen as a ramified network of diverse organizations, each exerting a definite influence on public life. Some of these organizations, consciously or by virtue of objective development, play a revolutionary role. Just as water flowing through the sluice-gate does not flood the ship but raises it higher, so the strengthening of the mass labor organizations does not detract from the role of the party, but presents new and more exacting demands.

II.

In our dynamic time, theory acquires

much greater importance in analyzing social development, forming a closer understanding of events and a clearer picture of the future. Lenin wrote: "He who tackles partial problems without having previously settled general problems, will inevitably and at every step 'come up against' these general problems without himself realizing it. To come up against them blindly in every individual case means to doom one's politics to the worst vacillation and lack of principle."

The success of the Communist movement is largely attributable to Marxist-Leninist theory. It provides a scientific and realistic substantiation for strategy and tactics that rules out spontaneity, passivity, subjectivism and reckless revolutionism. And it is no accident that all tendencies towards liquidation of the revolutionary party, whether emanating from the Right or the Left, reveal a disparaging attitude towards theory and its denial—in deed if not in word—as a major factor of social development. Rejection of laws of objective development, a feature of Right-wing opportunism, serves as justification for passivity and renunciation of the movement's ultimate aims. Some of the latter-day extremists call for "liberation from the clutches of theory," so as to be able to shape strategy and tactics according to their own subjective views.

Inasmuch as theory is based on accumulated experience, their slogan is: "Liberate the present from the past." The authors of this formula who, incidentally, claim to be the sole source of revolutionary thought, have no use for the "senile liturgy of ossified formulas" or for "barren schemas" which, they allege, are carried over from one period to another, from one country to another. Apparently this ideological nihilism can be explained (but not justified) as a reaction to dogmatism in the realm of theory.

Marxist-Leninist theory, a potent revolutionary weapon, is constantly perfected and enriched by the new developments. Marxism is a science, and as such is bound to develop. Marx's theory, Engels wrote in 1895, "does not provide set dogmas; it provides the starting point and the method for investigation." But theory can make no contribution to the movement if it is seen merely as a collection of fixed propositions applied without relevance to specific situations. That attitude can only hinder the working out of bold decisions.

No one has yet suggested discarding a good tool because we have not learned to use it properly—the thing is to learn to use it. There is this example: the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Mexico stressed the need to strengthen party influence among the workers and overcome the “historical weakness” resulting from concentration on rural areas. On the other hand, the party must overcome the “paucity of its theoretical heritage,” for it can make no headway without serious theoretical research.

The significance and value of theoretical research are growing, and not only because the world situation is moving at a faster pace, posing new problems concerning the evolution of state-monopoly capitalism, the Third World, the social consequences and prospects of the technological revolution, and numerous other problems the need to study which was stressed at the recent Budapest Consultative Meeting. Theoretical research is needed also because of the far-reaching changes in the status of the party in society and in the nature of its work. The time has long passed when the Communist parties confined themselves to criticizing capitalism and could give only a very general forecast for the future.

In a number of countries the Communists are now a strong political force with which the ruling element must reckon. Although not in the government, the Communists consider themselves, in a certain sense, a government party and not merely an opposition that says “no” on all short-term and long-term issues. They are prepared to assume responsibility for the future of their people and offer alternatives that would set the country on the road to peace, democracy and socialism. Besides, the situation can change in a way that will make Communist participation in government possible and necessary—Finland is a case in point.

Communist parties do not confine themselves to advancing general political concepts; they advance concrete proposals based on an analysis of the processes at work in every area of public life. To an investment policy geared to benefit the monopolies, they contrast a policy designed to benefit the people; to monopoly programming they contrast their own planning proposals, and the same in foreign policy, education, technological progress, housing, etc.

In the past ten years many Communist

parties have founded Marxist research centers or have set up research groups to formulate party policy on various economic and cultural issues. In all the parties there is a growing interest in international Marxist research conferences, seminars, etc., which provide an opportunity to exchange experience, study each other's views and form a more comprehensive picture of problems and solutions.

Substantiated policies and effective slogans are an important, but by no means the only, factor of success. The best explanation of the world might not recruit a single new supporter. The Canadian Party and several other parties have noted that many workers accept Communist ideas but not the Communist party as such. This leads to a contradictory situation: the party's slogans and ideas are taken up by democratic forces, trade unions and other organizations as a guide to action.

Many examples could be cited of such “take-overs.” And having to choose between two organizations advancing the same slogan, the workers will support the one that appears stronger and more viable. For they do not always realize that Communist slogans are often seized upon not in order to carry them out, but simply to “hug them to death.”

And that the Communists are capable of formulating correct, revolutionary slogans, is a sign of their theoretical maturity; that they are not always able to employ this to the best advantage is a sign of organizational weakness.

In analyzing the decline in the Communist position in the last elections, the Belgian Communist Party Central Committee said that this was due to the “still inadequate presence of the party in concrete political actions, which tended to weaken the revolutionary clarity of our program.” This gap between organizational strength and the requirements of political struggle has been noted by many Communist parties, including some that have made a good showing in mass activity.

The structure of the Communist Party is, of course, determined by its aims. Inasmuch as socialism cannot be achieved by the efforts of individual sections or groups of the working class, there must be a united, coordinated effort. This presupposes centralization of all activity, and centralism, therefore, becomes the only possible organizational principle of a really revolutionary party. Especially now, with

the high concentration of capital, imperialist global policy and the heterogeneous structure of the social forces participating in the anti-imperialist struggle, the need for centralism in guiding the workers' movement cannot be overestimated.

But the Communist party is a voluntary organization and can therefore be organized only along democratic lines: its centralism must be democratic.

Democratic centralism, the organizational expression of the party's revolutionary character, provides ample room for free discussion, membership participation in shaping policy and in determining the composition of leading bodies and their collective work, and assures the necessary coordination and discipline. Two principles, centralism and democracy, are combined to form a flexible whole.

The Communist parties work in widely differing conditions, and this determines the different relationship between centralism and democracy. The Spanish Communist Party accepts democratic centralism as its organizational principle, but in the conditions created by the Franco regime it cannot give full scope to inner-party democracy. That might prove fatal to the party, which has to work illegally and is subject to harsh repressions. The Tenth Congress of the Colombian Communist Party inserted a new clause in the Party Rules authorizing the Central Committee to assure continued operation of the party under all conditions. The Central Committee is empowered to restrict or annul provisions of the Rules in order to safeguard the Party, its organizations and leaders.

On the other hand, Communist parties working in legal conditions—parties that regard the struggle for democracy as the road to socialism—fully abide by democratic procedures. In fact, no party allows such open self-criticism and such freedom in discussing its affairs as the Communists do.

Sectarian, dogmatic infringements of democratic centralism usually tend towards abolition of democracy, suppression of rank-and-file rights and initiative, and implantation of administrative methods as a substitute for conviction. Centralism is thus perverted into rigid administration. The revisionists, at the other end of the political spectrum, interpret democracy in a way that could turn an active militant party into a debating club.

In its pre-Congress statement, the Executive of the Swiss Party of Labor, reaffirming the party's adherence to democratic centralism, says: "This means that our chief problem today is how to assure observance and application of the Leninist norms in our day-to-day work. We must devise the best means of combining broad democracy with strict discipline. This implies keeping in constant touch with the free discussions taking place in the party, in which there must be full opportunity for fraternal confrontation of views. However, the party's practical work should not suffer; it should be conducted in the spirit of united effort, without interruptions and wrong moves."

Experience has shown that it is not always easy to strike a correct balance between centralism and democracy. Any imbalance, no matter what its causes, is bound to have an adverse effect on the party's activity. But he who would make this the excuse for abandoning democratic centralism would be chopping down the tree only because some of its branches had withered and others were growing in the wrong direction. These defects can be removed only on a live tree, not after the tree has been cut down.

Democratic centralism enables the party to regroup its forces to meet changing situations and new forms of struggle. Lenin wrote in this context: "Every form of struggle requires a corresponding technique and a corresponding apparatus. When objective conditions make the parliamentary struggle the principal form of struggle, the features of the apparatus for parliamentary struggle inevitably become more marked in the party. When, on the other hand, objective conditions give rise to a struggle of the masses in the form of mass political strikes and uprisings, the party of the proletariat *must* have an 'apparatus' to 'serve' these forms of struggle, and, of course, this must be a special 'apparatus', not resembling the parliamentary one."

The multiformity of the present-day working-class struggle requires specialization of Communist cadres. The party must have men with experience in municipal, parliamentary, trade-union, cooperative affairs, and so on. The present scope and nature of the labor movement make it possible for the working class to form at least part of its intelligentsia even before its advent to power by recruiting progressive intellectuals and advancing workers to

positions where they can acquire the necessary knowledge and experience.

The Italian Communist Party has 24,800 municipal councillors, 650 provincial councillors and 805 city mayors. No less than 100,000 members of the French Communist Party are active in municipal, trade union and other organizations or in the press. And it is by their work that the people judge the Communists, their approach to issues, their organizational ability and initiative.

But every function has its intrinsic logic. A man kept on a certain job for a long time acquires the necessary skill, but he might also acquire the notion that his particular field is the only one that counts. This could narrow his vision, lead him to lose sight of the movement's ultimate aims.

At its plenary meeting early this year, the Central Committee of the French Communist Party noted that the Gaullists made no secret of their intention to exploit the new Communist line in the struggle for democracy to "compel the Communists to be like all the others . . . cease being a Marxist-Leninist party, a party of a new type." But the Communist Party, committed to social revolution, is not to be sidetracked into any specific form of struggle. It seeks to use all forms and is able correctly to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each. Besides, the party is a collective of men and women acting in various fields. Each contributes his or her experience, and on this basis the party is able to rectify one-sided approaches by individuals or by the organization as a whole.

Revolutionary Marxists analyze objective reality not in order to justify passivity by pleading that the conditions are not yet ripe for decisive action, but in order to find forms and methods most suitable to concrete situations. The first Russian revolutionary Marxist paper carried the motto, "The spark will kindle the flame." But for the flame to be kindled, there must be inflammable material, and it has to be ignited. In application to politics this means that the most careful analysis cannot yet provide certain proof that all the conditions exist for the spark to develop into a flame. This can be ascertained only by experiment. "No socialist party in the world," Lenin wrote after the 1905 revolution, "could wrest the masses from the influence of the liberal or radical bourgeois parties, which base themselves on the mentality of the

philistine, without giving them a jolt, without meeting with some resistance, without taking the risk involved in the *first experiment*." There might be mistakes, but let us leave it to "the philistines to pride themselves on the infallibility of their revolutionary inaction."

The risk involved in such a "first experiment" has nothing in common with impatience. But when the objective need arises to intensify the struggle, the revolutionary spirit of any party is immediately tested by its ability to take the initiative, set the goals and go into action. No one can tell beforehand where the "jolt" will come from; no one can foresee the contradictions that will beset the movement. But that only underlines the importance of knowing how and when to change tactics, the importance of being able to assess rapidly moving situations.

It was not so long ago that the United States boasted of its prosperity and the absence of sharp social conflicts. But the war in Vietnam has roused to action large sections of American youth, intellectuals and workers. The misery of the Negro population has led to outbreaks of civil war in many parts of the country. Or consider the recent events in France. They began with student demonstrations in support of the demand for democratic educational reforms. The students were supported by the workers and the movement soon broke out of its restricted framework. Never since the days of the Popular Front (more than 30 years ago) has France seen such a determined and mass struggle of the working people for social rights and against monopoly omnipotence as it did in May.

These events have shaken France, but their implications go far beyond that country. They concern the entire international labor movement, inasmuch as they confirm the correctness of revolutionary Marxism and the incorrectness of those who question the revolutionary spirit of the Communist parties and the working class, to which they oppose the students and intellectuals as the only force capable of transforming capitalist society.

There is a direct link between the initiative and activity of a party and the size of its membership and mass influence. A mass party is needed as the prime condition for an effective Communist contribution to national life. But a mass party can be built up only through effective activity. The

vicious circle can be eliminated only by taking the risk of the "first experiment," that is, by taking the initiative and correctly appraising—and correctly expressing—the will of the masses.

The Spanish Communist Party has built up a large membership despite the harsh conditions of illegality. It was able to do so because it is a party of constant action, keeps abreast of the problems that are uppermost in the minds of the people, who understand and accept its policy and feel its presence in all their struggles. The fact that there are many young people in its ranks indicates that the revolutionary processes among the youth are not by-passing the party but tend to strengthen it.

Party influence among intellectuals is of immense importance. Intellectuals should be recruited to support the working class and their knowledge applied in the battle for the fundamental transformation of society.

However, though party-building is important and necessary, it is not the only criterion of a party's revolutionary method.

The time has long passed when, as Marx wrote, the working class "was supported only by itself," and in most countries the position has changed radically since the time when Lenin described Russia's revolutionary Marxists as a small group marching hand-in-hand and surrounded on all sides by enemies. Today the forces ranged against capitalism have grown immeasurably. And though they differ in political, philosophical and ethical outlook, they can be brought together in a single army capable of fighting for peace, democracy and social progress.

The revolutionary devotion of a Communist is measured not only by the strength of his convictions and his self-sacrificing activity, but also by his ability to unite all the forces opposed to imperialism. Objective conditions in the early years of the movement engendered distrust in non-communist elements and a desire to safeguard the purity of communist views by avoiding contact with other groups. But that is a thing of the distant past.

Radicalization of the petty-bourgeoisie in many countries provides a receptive soil for extremist theories and views, but the Communists do not shy away from contacts or alliance even with these sections. They welcome the influx of fresh forces into the revolutionary movement as one more proof of the deepening general crisis of capitalism and the wide spread of revolutionary ideas. But the Communists fully appreciate the fact that it will require tremendous effort, in the fields of theory and practice, effectively to integrate these forces in the working-class struggle.

The progress of the French Communist Party is largely due to its unremitting efforts for unity of all the democratic forces, for political unity of the working class and alignment with other labor parties, above all the Socialist party. In this the Communists are guided by Lenin's proposition that effective struggle is the surest way to unity.

The Marxist-Leninist parties are living, developing organizations. They are parties of action capable of devising the forms and methods that best suit objective conditions. This is the source of their viability.

Election victory of communists and left forces in Italy

CARLO GALUZZI

The Italian General Election held over May 19-20 rounded off the long and vigorously conducted election campaign and resulted in a resounding victory for the Communist Party and the united Left; it confirmed the rejection of the electorate of the Center-Left policy. The Communist Party made big advances both in votes polled and in seats gained in the Chamber of Deputies where it ran on an independent ticket, and in the Senate where it joined forces with the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (ISSPU), independents and autonomous Socialists. Compared with the previous general election the Communist Party increased its

vote by 787,876 in the Chamber and the number of seats by 11. The Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, contesting an election for the first time (it was formed in 1964, when the Left wing broke with the Socialist Party), polled 1,414,128 votes which gave it 23 seats in the Chamber. In the election to the Senate the workers' parties together received 101 seats, polling 8,580,613 votes, or 30 per cent of the total. (Only citizens over 25 have the right to vote in elections to the Senate; in elections to the Chamber—at the age of 21.)

The full implications of the voting are clearly seen from the general picture of the election results:

Party	1968 Elections			Changes since 1963		
	Votes (in thous.)	% %	Seats	Votes (in thous.)	% %	Seats
CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES						
Communists	8,555	26.9	177	+ 788	+1.6	+11
Proletarian Socialists	1,414	4.5	23	—	—	—
Christian Democrats	12,429	39.1	266	+ 687	+0.8	+ 6
United Socialists	4,604	14.5	91	—1,528	—5.5	—29
Republicans	626	2.0	9	+ 206	+0.6	+ 3
Liberals	1,850	5.8	31	— 294	—1.2	— 8
Neofascists	1,415	4.5	24	— 154	—0.6	— 3
Monarchists	414	1.3	6	— 123	—0.4	— 2
Others	477	1.4	3	+ 101	+0.2	—
SENATE						
Communists, Proletarian Socialists	8,581	30.0	101	+1,589	+4.5	+16
Christian Democrats	10,956	38.4	135	+ 738	+1.2	+ 2
United Socialists	4,350	15.2	46	—1,244	—5.1	—12
Republicans	627	2.2	2	+ 403	+1.4	+ 2
Liberals	1,934	6.8	16	— 132	—0.7	— 3
Neofascists	1,305	4.6	11	— 390	—1.6	— 4
Monarchists	312	1.0	2	— 117	—0.6	—
Others	520	1.8	2	+ 267	+0.9	— 1

The slight increase in the Christian Democrat vote (0.8 per cent compared with 1963) was obviously secured by the switch-over to them of part of the voters for the extreme Right parties. But this gain is much less than the losses suffered by the Right parties (their vote declined 2.2 per cent). In other words, although the Christian Democrats gained at the expense of the extreme Right, they lost to the Left.

In an attempt to minimize the victory of the Communist Party the bourgeois press claimed that it was entirely due to the internal difficulties of the United Socialist Party and the fact that the government had failed to live up to its promises contained in the Center-Left program. However, the press conveniently forgot to mention that already in the 1963 general election the Communist Party had made a big advance compared with 1958, gaining one million votes at the very time the Center-Left coalition was formed which, as envisaged by the Christian Democrats and the Rights in the Socialist Party, was designed, on the one hand, to hurt the Communist Party and, on the other, to achieve the integration of the working class in the neo-capitalist system.

To this end the apologists of the Center-Left promised that once the Socialists were in office they would usher in a new phase, viz., a phase of reforms that would give the working class a say in public affairs. Actually, however, it was a question of finding the means which would enable the Christian Democrats, relying on the Social Democrats, to maintain their monopoly of power, strongly undermined by the united struggle of the working-class and the anti-fascist forces in 1960—a struggle which predetermined the overthrow of Tambroni's clerical-fascist government — and by the Christian Democrat's telling defeat at the 1963 elections when it lost one million votes, or about 4.1 per cent of the total.

The five years of the Center-Left Government enabled the Christian Democrats to maintain and strengthen their rule to the detriment of the working masses, to the detriment of a truly independent foreign policy of peace. During these years the government tried to impose an incomes policy promoting the growth of capitalist profits and the process of monopoly concentration and thereby worsening the conditions of the working people. They were years during which Prime Minister Moro displayed his "understanding" of U.S.

aggression in Vietnam, while Nenni's party docilely accepted the Atlantic policy. This is the source of the profound dissatisfaction and concern evident among the most articulate part of the Catholic world and those of its sections closely associated with the working class and responsive to the ideas of renovation expressed at the Ecumenical Council. Hence also, on the other hand, the first split in the Socialist Party which brought with it the founding in 1964 of the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity and, on the other, growing united action between the General Confederation of Labor and the Catholic trade union center CISL, which subsequently was joined also by the Social Democratic Union, the UIL. This unity made it possible to launch the widespread struggle of recent years for the immediate demands of the working people. It was this unity of millions of working people—Catholics, Socialists and Communists—that nullified the incomes policy and at the same time frustrated the designs of the Center-Left to integrate the working-class in the capitalist system.

This triggered off the political and economic crisis of 1964 which the Christian Democrats tried to counter with a coup d'état. In accordance with a NATO plan it was to be carried out by the secret services together with pro-American and reactionary political, economic and military circles. The attempt failed because of the immediate reaction of the masses in response to the call of the Communist Party.

However, instead of drawing the necessary lesson from this anti-democratic trend in the Center-Left, and joining with the Left, Nenni accepted the new *diktat* of the Christian Democrats. Although this caused another split in the Socialist Party, (a number of prominent members withdrew from it and formed the Autonomous Socialist Movement), Nenni tried to unite with the Social Democrats, hoping thereby to achieve his original aim, namely, that of isolating the Communist Party. Meanwhile the protest movement of the youth, intelligentsia, and women gained momentum and groups of "dissident Catholics" were formed in many cities.

The five years of the Center-Left were, then, years of struggle waged by the popular forces against a policy that promoted the interests of the big monopolies, Italian and foreign, at the expense of the interests of the working class and the peasantry. The big demonstrations for peace, against

the American aggression in Vietnam, against NATO, were the outcome of the peace movement which began with the Communists and Socialists for Proletarian Unity, subsequently spreading to other political sections of the population, including the "dissident Catholics," thus laying bare the profound differences between the government and the people.

Taking into account the failure of the Center-Left policy, the Communist Party emphasized in its election campaign that it was imperative to find a way out of the present situation of uncertainty and danger, and to direct Italy's political life along a new path.

"This is possible," the election program of the Communist Party stressed, "because the working people have been fighting for their interests and rights, to restrict as much as possible the harm caused to them and to the country by an unsuitable policy, and for a new economic policy and better conditions. Without the millions of hours of the strike movement of the workers and farm laborers, without the demonstrations and actions of the peasants in all parts of Italy, without the movement of all categories of the working people, the situation in our country would have been totally different today. The working people, men and women, did not submit and today, more so than ever before, represent a decisive force in every action for social progress and democratic repeneration."

The Party's confidence in the working people was fully rewarded at the elections. It strengthened its positions everywhere—in the cities and in the villages, in industrial centers, in the citadels of neo-capitalism, among the youth in the North and in the South, in the so-called white areas—the traditional strongholds of the Christian Democrats—such as Veneto, Upper Lombardy, southern Apulia, and also in the "red" areas—Emilia, Tuscany and Umbria where Communists represent the majority of the working people. This was the salient feature of the May 19-20 voting as distinct from the general election of five years ago when the Communist advance was due mainly to overwhelming support in the traditionally "red" areas. This is acknowledged, reluctantly it is true, even by the capitalist press. Thus, *Corriere della Sera* commented that the trend towards increasing the Party's influence changed significantly on May 19, chiefly because "the Communists won above all in the industrial

areas of the North; furthermore, in percentage this gain sometimes exceeds that in the places from which it traditionally draws its reserves." *Stampa*, mouthpiece of the FIAT monopoly, expressed alarm at the continued shift of big sections of the population towards the parties of the Left. "Every third Italian," *Stampa* bemoaned, "is either a Communist or a Proletarian Socialist. Tomorrow the numbers might be greater, and the Socialist Party (Nenni's) may find itself seriously weakened and disappear as a major democratic force. . . ."

These circles, associated with big industry at home, and with local and foreign capital, have every reason to be alarmed over the election results. In Turin, the cradle of Italian neo-capitalism and the citadel of FIAT, one of the biggest international automobile monopolies, the Communist Party emerged as the first party, gaining 226,705 votes (from 27.5 to 30 per cent), a lead of 25,000 over the Christian Democrats. It had a still bigger success in the communes in the industrial belt around Turin: in Settimo the Party increased its vote from 33.5 to 40.7 per cent, in Grugliasco from 39.2 to 45.8 per cent, in Venaria from 41.18 to 42.37, in Nichelino from 29.9 to 39.3, in Collengo from 39.8 to 41.18. In Milan, unofficial capital of industrial Italy, the Communists polled 264,566 votes, an increase of some 24 per cent, and throughout Lombardy—1,188,308, that is, 203,266 votes more than in the previous election. The Party greatly outdistanced the Nenni Socialist Party which suffered a crushing defeat in this area where its vote dropped from 1,212,024 votes in 1963 to 878,310. The Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity likewise scored a big victory in this area, winning 264,075 votes.

The Communist Party made headway also in Genoa (from 170,405 votes to 185,241, that is, 33.47 per cent of the total), and in Liguria as a whole (from 341,507 to 381,480); in Naples (city) from 155,113 to 182,682, an increase of from 24.3 to 28.8 per cent; in Taranto where the Party gained 12,000 votes, polling a total of 40,625 votes, raising its percentage from 26.8 to 34.06.

No less significant were the results in Rome and in the Lazio province. In Rome, 423,784 citizens voted for the Communists, thus proving the correctness and the impact of the ideas expounded by the Communist Party in the interests of cooperation between the progressive forces, secular and Catholic, who genuinely want to see a

renovation of Italian society. It was not accidental that the Conservative *Il Messaggero* commented: "There are many reasons for the gains made by the Communists, but there is no overlooking certain negative consequences responsibility for which rests with the Catholics participating in the so-called 'dialogue'."

This was further borne out by the substantial Communist gains in Veneto, regarded as the most "white" and most Catholic area on the geo-political map of Italy. In Veneto the Party became the second party after the Christian Democrats who, noticeably, are losing ground to the Communists particularly in the newer industrial centers where the young working class has been waging a hard struggle against the big monopolies and the incomes policy. Thus in Valdagno, the scene of recent disturbances and strike action by the workers of the Marzotto textile complex, which were accompanied by brutal police reprisals, the votes cast for the CP-SPPU increased from 1,057 to 2,282, or from 6.8 to 14 per cent. The Liberal vote dropped from 15.5 to 10.5 per cent, and that of the Christian Democrats from 56.7 to 52.9 per cent. In Pordenone, where the REX electrical appliances plant employing 10,000 workers is situated, the Communist vote increased by 50 per cent, in Muggie, a working-class center with militant traditions, the CP-SPPU polled 51.9 per cent of the vote, winning an absolute majority. In the province of Veneto the Nenni Socialist Party lost heavily, and the Christian Democrats, too, suffered appreciable losses, although they managed to retain their majority position thanks to gains at the expense of the extreme Right.

Province of Veneto	1963		1968	
	votes		votes	
	(in thous.)	%	(in thous.)	%
Communists	348	14.9	413	16.7
Proletarian Socialists	—	—	130	5.3
Christian Democrats	1,243	52.6	1,304	52.8
United Socialists	532	22.5	376	15.2
Republicans	11	0.5	20	0.8
Liberals	129	5.5	127	5.2
Monarchists	17	0.7	12	0.5
Neofascists	71	3.0	64	2.6
Others	9	0.4	23	0.9

In Trentino-Alto-Adige the Christian Democrat vote dropped 1.5 per cent, the SP—5.3 per cent, while the Communist vote showed an 0.9 per cent increase. In Friuli-Venezia Giulia the Christian Democrat vote rose slightly—0.2 per cent, the Communist vote rose from 18.3 to 19.8 per cent of the total and that of the Nenni Socialists dropped from 23.7 to 18.6 per cent.

The Party gained not only in Veneto where there are still considerable possibilities for winning the working people for socialism, but also of course in the "red" areas of Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany and Umbria where the rise in the Communist vote exceeded the average for the entire country: Emilia-Romagna—2.6 per cent, Tuscany—2.5 per cent, Umbria—3 per cent.

Province of Emilia-Romagna	1963		1968	
	votes		votes	
	(in thous.)	%	(in thous.)	%
Communists	1,018	40.6	1,115	43.2
Proletarian Socialists	—	—	127	4.9
Christian Democrats	651	26.0	687	26.7
United Socialists	521	20.8	371	14.4
Republicans	74	3.0	79	3.1
Liberals	141	5.7	120	4.7
Monarchists	11	0.5	9	0.4
Neofascists	74	3.0	62	2.4
Others	10	0.4	5	0.2

Province of Tuscany	1963		1968	
	votes		votes	
	(in thous.)	%	(in thous.)	%
Communists	864	38.5	945	41.0
Proletarian Socialists	—	—	109	4.8
Christian Democrats	683	30.4	709	30.9
United Socialists	448	20.0	315	13.7
Republicans	35	1.6	41	1.8
Liberals	105	4.7	89	3.8
Monarchists	11	0.5	7	0.3
Neofascists	89	4.0	80	3.5
Others	5	0.3	5	0.2

Province of Umbria	1963		1968	
	votes (in thous.)	%	votes (in thous.)	%
Communists	199	38.8	215	41.8
Proletarian				
Socialists	—	—	28	5.5
Christian				
Democrats	156	30.5	155	30.0
United				
Socialists	98	19.2	64	12.5
Republicans	9	1.7	10	1.9
Liberals	16	3.2	13	2.5
Monarchist	2	0.4	2	0.4
Neofascists	31	6.0	28	5.4
Others	1	0.2	—	—

The Communist vote rose considerably also in Marche—from 30 to 32.2 per cent, Lazio—from 25.4 to 27.6 per cent, Abruzzi—from 24.4 to 25.4 per cent, Molise—from 16.5 to 18.1 per cent, Campagna—from 22.3 to 23.3 per cent, Apulia—from 26.2 to 27.2 per cent, and Sardinia—from 22.3 to 23.7 per cent.

These figures confirm that the Party's policy aimed at renovating the South has met with response in these regions, although the overall proportion of electors who voted for the Party there remained unchanged—24.1 per cent—due to some losses in Lucania, Calabria and Sicily.

We see, then, that our Party and the proletarian Left, increased their influence not so much in the areas of poverty and economic depression, as in the most economically developed regions stretching from Turin to Milan, Mantua to Genoa, Ravenna to Livorno, Valdarno to Prato, Spezia to Terni, including the industrial centers of the South: Naples, Taranto, Syracuse, Brindisi, Cogliari.

The Party also strengthened its position among the peasants and the youth. In the countryside, barring the more backward regions of Lucania, Calabria and Sicily where, apart from anything else, wholesale emigration has weakened many Party organizations—the Party influence rose considerably among the farm laborers and sharecroppers in Central and Northern Italy and, even more important, among the small farmers, traditionally under the influence of the Christian Democrats.

This places a greater responsibility on the Party towards the rural population, particularly in view of the dissatisfaction and difficulties experienced by the peasantry as a result of Common Market policy.

Hence Luigi Longo's letter to Prime Minister Moro sent before the new parliament met, urging a halt to the Common Market measures in the sphere of agriculture, and that agrarian reforms be carried out, the main demand of the peasant struggle.

As the communique issued by the Leadership of the Party notes, the election success of the Party and the Left opposition was "determined by the fact that they were able to fuse the demands for renovation, the leitmotif of the movements and struggle developing in the country of late." The Communique went on, "And from France, thanks to the renewed unity of the popular and Left forces, comes another inspiring example and stimulus to advance along the path of struggle for democracy and socialism."

Socialism is the general perspective of the Italian working class movement and has always been in the center of the election struggle inspiring the protest movement and anti-capitalist actions of the youth and the working people. The Party was able to unite these movements, and at the same time to repel and smash the disgraceful anti-Communist and anti-Soviet campaign conducted by bourgeois propaganda, particularly in connection with the events in Czechoslovakia.

The Party's election program clearly stated: "We are fighting for socialism along the lines indicated by Gramsci and Togliatti, and we want its features to be freedom and democracy, the ability constantly to enrich itself and develop. Such socialist democracy must rely on a network of autonomous movements, for it is the autonomy of the trade unions and public organizations, the autonomy of culture, the autonomy and existence of several parties that will produce a dialectical situation, incontestably complicated and full of contradictions, but which for all that will be a valuable source of democratic stimulus and affirmation of freedom against the danger of bureaucratic and authoritarian deviations. We want to build a socialist state, absolutely secular, which will be neither atheistic nor confessional, a pluralist state in which no ideology or religious faith will enjoy an exclusive position or privileges. Such is the line which inspires us, and which we call the Italian way to socialism, as distinct from the paths followed by other countries and which corresponded to their specific conditions and historical requirements but not to ours.

That is why we welcomed and encouraged the steps that have been and will be taken towards a more fully developed socialist democracy in these countries which, like Czechoslovakia, have already created a socialist economic system. The true image of socialism which emerges increasingly after the initial and major socio-economic gains—is the image of a society of new and unprecedented freedom for all people, liberated finally from the fetters of exploitation and want, and who have become the masters of their own destiny and their own history. We want to advance towards such a society in a situation of democracy and peace, and with full respect for the big democratic and civil gains of the Italian people, following the finest traditions of our culture. The May 19-20 general election was an important stage in this direction.”

The election results bespeak a definite turn to the Left. The voting was a condemnation of the Center-Left government and of the Nenni policy of subordination to the conservative aims of Christian Democracy. It was an expression of the will, particularly of the workers, peasants and youth, to alter the face of Italian society and clear the way for a real alternative to bourgeois and monopoly power, an alternative based on unity of all the democratic and socialist forces. It should be noted that in the elections to the Chamber the Communists and Proletarian Socialists together polled 31.4 per cent of the vote, that is, the same as the People's Front obtained in 1948 when it included also the Nenni Socialists.

The votes cast for the Communist Party then, were votes for a party able to fight, a party enjoying international prestige and working for unity. The attempts of the Christian Democrats and their allies to represent our Party as an isolated party, “out of the game,” whose sole means of defense now are protests, foundered in the face of the contribution made by the Communist Party towards resolving some of the urgent national and international issues. In its fight for economic and social reforms, and for the interests of the working people, in its exposure of the corruption and nepotism in government circles, by developing actions for democracy in the factory, in the school, for the family, in society as a whole, the Party showed the electorate that it was a decisive force capable of realizing the fundamental changes needed by our society. The actions carried out by the Communists in defense of peace, and

for peace in Vietnam, their condemnation of America's aggression and its crimes against this heroic people, the support rendered them by the Party through mass actions and political and diplomatic initiatives in particular—all this was seen by the electorate as proof of the weighty and indispensable role played by the Communist Party in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.

The election victory therefore places new and added responsibility on Italian Communists, confronts them with new tasks. The central problem continues to be that of the unity of all democratic forces, secular and Catholic, in the fight for the aspirations of the working class and the young generation for democratic renovation. Unity and popular struggle are the means with the help of which the road can be cleared for a fundamental change in the government of the country.

The election results, the fight for peace in Vietnam, the demonstrations of the youth, the strikes by workers and peasants show that it is possible to advance to socialism the peaceful and democratic way.

Our task is to give leadership to the movement for renovation and channel it towards concrete political aims: dissolution of the Center-Left and establishment of a democratic government that would effect deep-going changes in the direction of socialism.

The defeat of the Nenni Socialist Party has started a process of critical reappraisal in its ranks. Far from remaining aloof from this, we should participate in it, should give every support and encouragement to the desire for unity. The same can and should be done in relation to the Catholic world, for the votes of the Right, which saved the Christian Democrats from electoral defeat have not resolved the internal contradictions in the party of the Catholics. On the contrary, these contradictions have become more acute. This probably will trigger off new positive processes among the Christian Democrats and in the Catholic world, processes which should be encouraged.

The Communists must therefore concentrate above all on national issues, in unitary actions to resolve these issues. We must act from the premise that a broad popular struggle can be developed with a political perspective.

To this end we need a stronger party, need to increase its membership. But even

more important, we need a younger, more vigorous party, a party that will make way, right up to its leading bodies, for the dynamic energy of the youth.

We should act as one, but this does not mean that we should avoid discussion within our own ranks and in our relations with others. We must be able to elaborate and firmly carry out a unitary policy in all parts of the country.

The Party's big advance has, in a sense, answered those who regarded the Italian Communists as already "part of the establishment"; this advance again demonstrated the Party's strength and ability to put forward its own alternative.

All this is, of course, a source of satisfaction for us Communists, but not a self-laudation. It is a stimulus to improve our work and continue the struggle, to pursue still more vigorously the line we have been following all these years at home and in our relations with the international working class movement—the line of autonomy and internationalism, of unity in diversity.

Our electoral success shows that the vast majority of the working people want to advance towards socialism, want to help bring about the reconstruction of the whole of Western Europe. Furthermore, this success corroborates the truth—at any rate as far as the Italian situation is concerned—of what Luigi Longo said at the March

Central Committee meeting: "Those who see in our constant call for equality, autonomy, sovereignty and independence of the Communist and Workers' parties a tendency to weaken proletarian internationalism and to yield to the pressure of bourgeois ideology, are deeply mistaken. Our Party and also the Italian working-class and democratic movement—and we say this not boastfully but with conviction and in the knowledge that we have always performed our duty—have always displayed solidarity with and rendered concrete aid to the movements and the struggle of the peoples for freedom, and against imperialism and the fascist and reactionary forces in different countries, thus giving the lie to any doubts or insinuations on this score. We are proud of this contribution made by the Italian working-class movement. We see this as an expression of our influence and our strength, for we have succeeded in this struggle in bringing about an ever growing unity of broad socialist, Catholic and democratic masses, have succeeded in uniting most of the people in the fight for peace."

And we are preparing with confidence, a confidence inspired by the support our policy received from the working class and the working people generally, to carry on in the country and in parliament the battle for the Italian road to socialism.

First things first: stop the bombing

The Vietnam-American talks in Paris to pave the way for negotiations envisaging a political solution have been going on for well over a month.

It will be recalled that in its Note of May 3 the Democratic Republic of Vietnam consented to the Paris talks in order "to determine with the American side an unconditional halt to the bombing and all other United States acts of war against Vietnam and afterwards hold talks on other problems of interest to the two sides." The official Washington reply accepted this main purpose of the talks. It should, therefore, have been the object of the first official encounters to come to terms on this

urgent issue, any delay in which only results in more death and destruction.

However, Averell Harriman, the U.S. spokesman, has so far talked of everything but halting the bombing and other acts of aggression, seeking in every possible way to draw the DRV delegation into a discussion of political issues and sidestepping the main item on the agenda.

This bears out earlier apprehensions that this time, too, U.S. diplomacy would, behind the smokescreen of its "eagerness to negotiate," pursue ends that in no way resemble any desire for peace. These dilatory tactics are evidently designed to cover up preparations for armed operations on a

still larger scale, to impress on the public the "intractable posture" of the Vietnamese and then use this "intractability" as an excuse for renewing the bombing of all DRV territory in an all-out effort for a military victory in South Vietnam.

A U.S. official let the cat out of the bag. William J. Jorden, a member of the U.S. delegation in Paris, said on May 17 that the situation did not warrant an end to the bombing, while White House Press Secretary George Christian amplified on the same day that no substantial cut in the bombing has occurred.

Quite the reverse, U.S. bombing has been intensified, and so have the punitive operations in South Vietnam. This occurred the day after Lyndon Johnson announced the "bombing restriction." *Nhan Dan*, a Vietnam daily, reported on June 10 that 2,500 bombing raids were carried out in 21 provinces and five cities of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in March, while as many as 3,500 were made in April on four southern provinces and the Vinling district. In March, U.S. planes bombed and strafed some 2,000 targets in all North Vietnam, while under the "restriction" strikes were made at 2,300 targets in April and 3,700 in May in the southern zone.

Bombers, to say nothing of reconnaissance planes, fly far beyond the "restricted bombing" zone. The *Nhan Dan* reports that at the end of April and in May bombs fell on Laichau, a province several hundred kilometres northwest of Hanoi, and that the Bachlongvi islands near Haiphong were being methodically bombed.

Johnson's "restricted bombing" scheme was accompanied by an all-out U.S. effort to turn the tide in South Vietnam. On March 31 he announced further reinforcements, with the first shipment totalling 11,000 Marines and airborne troops early in April and another 13,500 scheduled to go in the next few months. At the beginning of April Johnson conferred with his top military and diplomatic aides on current and future plans. In the middle of April he convened a conference in Honolulu which, U.S. observers report, went into the strategy and tactics in Vietnam, and at the end of May he asked Congress for an additional \$3,900 million for the Vietnam war (his second request this year), while the *Washington Post* indicated that the budget estimates for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969 allocated \$102,000 million to the Pentagon, of which \$28,000 million for the Vietnam war.

In South Vietnam punitive expeditions against partisans and civilians have been stepped up. A large-scale operation involving 100,000 U.S. and puppet Saigon troops was mounted against 11 provinces in April. U.S. planes, including strategic B-52 bombers, are assaulting South Vietnam towns (Saigon too) and other densely populated areas.

On Washington orders, the Saigon puppet government is conscripting another 135,000 men; a general mobilization of all able-bodied men from 18 to 43 has been announced.

This seems to indicate that the talk about negotiations is designed to allay public opinion, and that a further escalation of the aggression is under way.

Yet the facts show that the U.S. drive for a military victory is senseless. Internal and external forces have entered into the picture, strong enough to compel the U.S. government to halt its aggression and secure a peaceful solution in the national interest of the Vietnamese.

The defensive power of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is growing with the help of the socialist countries, while U.S. air losses are steadily mounting, with total casualties in the war approaching 3,000 planes.

The armed forces of South Vietnam are pummelling the U.S. occupation troops and the puppet Saigon army. Fighting in and around Saigon has been in progress for more than four months, and all U.S. efforts there to smash the regular units and partisans of the National Liberation Front have proved futile.

The stepped-up offensive of the People's Armed Forces has deepened the crisis of the Thieu-Ky regime.

The South Vietnam patriots are gaining fresh strength. People formerly passive, even neutral, are joining the fight. Now organizations have appeared in South Vietnam towns with patriotic anti-imperialist slogans. A conference early in May to found the Union of National, Democratic and Peace Forces of Vietnam was attended by intellectuals, students, writers, journalists, industrialists, businessmen, former officers and officials of the puppet regime, people of different political and religious convictions belonging to different political parties and organizations. In a communique, the newly-founded Union announced that it did not claim any monopoly of power after the overthrow of the Thieu-Ky clique and advocated a coalition government, joint

action with the National Liberation Front and a common effort to "regain national independence, rehabilitate the country and secure a free and happy life for the people."

In a message of greeting, the National Liberation Front expressed its confidence that the Union would "contribute to the further growth of the united national front against the U.S. aggressors and Vietnamese traitors. . . . Acting on its consistent policy of rallying the people against the common enemy, the National Liberation Front will cooperate with and stand beside the Union in fighting for the sacred national rights now and in the future national reconstruction."

The founding of the Union is the logical result of the recent politico-military situation in South Vietnam, especially in the towns. Due to the antagonism between the people of Vietnam, on the one hand, and the American invaders and their henchmen, on the other, political polarization has progressed rapidly. That the war in South Vietnam is nationwide is now more obvious than ever.

By consenting to the official conversations in Paris, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam demonstrated its good will, and the U.S. rulers should realize that it offers them a way out of the Vietnam stalemate. They should realize, too, that the DRV goodwill is no sign of weakness or of any inclination to unilateral concessions. "We are confident of our strength," Xuan Thuy, head of the Vietnam delegation to Paris, said. "We know that our struggle is not only in

our own interest, but also in that of the socialist countries and of world peace. The socialist countries are helping us, and people are coming to realize throughout the world that justice is on our side."

The more sober-minded U.S. rulers are beginning to draw the due conclusions, criticizing the tactics of U.S. diplomacy in Paris. For example, Senator Javits expressed surprise that while the talks were taking place in Paris U.S. planes were intensifying their raids on the southern regions of the DRV and U.S. troops in South Vietnam were trying to mount offensive operations against the National Liberation Front. Democratic Senator Hart told the Senate that he was dismayed to see influential people in the U.S. government still clinging to the illusion that a military solution was possible in Vietnam.

The peace initiative of the DRV government, supported by all progressives, leaves it to the U.S. rulers either to make what Walter Lippmann described as a "big and brave decision," that is, halt the bombing of the DRV, withdraw the troops from Vietnam and embark on peace, or to expose themselves before the world, which will judge U.S. intentions not by "words about peace" but by the practical results and by the attitude to the peace-making efforts of the DRV government.

Nhan Dan wrote: "It is now the U.S. government's turn to show goodwill. Failing this, it will bear all the blame for difficulties that may arise in the talks."

JAN PRAZSKY

Violence in the citadel of the "free world"

The assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy came as a crushing blow to the American people. The shock was not limited merely to those who supported Kennedy's attempt to win the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party. The assassination was one more feature added to the emerging pattern of violence and brutality.

What did Robert Kennedy represent, why was he murdered, and what is the significance of his death for the future of our country and the world? These questions, of course, are very difficult to answer with any precision or certainty. However, the significance of the event requires American Communists to make an analysis of what happened, and to take into account the

new political situation arising from the assassination.

We can begin by stating emphatically that Robert Kennedy was not murdered because he represented a threat to American capitalism. Kennedy was no tribune of the common man, no visionary of a new social system. He was the political spokesman for one section of American finance capital.

Yet he had considerable support in the impoverished Black and Spanish-speaking communities, and a considerable following among industrial workers. Despite his Big Business connections, Kennedy was the only presidential aspirant who geared his campaign to the growing discontent among national minority and working class people.

His program, however, was woefully inadequate. Although he appealed to the overwhelming desire of the American people for peace in Vietnam, he backed away from any clear-cut policy to end the war. For the impoverished Black people, he could promise nothing more than tax incentives for private investment in the ghetto areas. But the improvements he advocated were envisaged exclusively for the ghetto areas. Beside assuaging segregationist anxieties he made demagogic appeals to "law and order" to avert ghetto uprisings. For unemployment, falling real wages and declining social services he offered one solution—government tax incentives to private investors.

In essence, Kennedy offered rhetoric and empty promises to a people in crisis. And yet, instinctively, the people were drawn to him; for them he was their sole realistic hope for change. While his program was inadequate, at least he talked openly about the problems and the worsening conditions of the American people. They supported him in large numbers because he could not be worse, in fact, he had to be better than the present administration.

What Kennedy represented, then, was a tactical retreat for American imperialism. It was not his intention to improve the conditions of the people at the expense of monopoly profits. He simply wanted to extricate the United States from its disastrous military situation, believing that as a natural consequence of ending the war, the domestic crisis would ease. A small governmental push in the right direction and conditions would return to "normal."

Actually the candidacy of Senator McCarthy is more representative of the popu-

lar dissatisfaction with monopoly dominated politics. But McCarthy, whose popular support equalled that of Kennedy, and is certainly much greater than that of Humphrey, is not regarded as any serious threat to the forces presently dominating the Democratic Party. The primaries do not determine the candidate to be nominated, he is chosen at the National Convention by delegates the great majority of whom are not bound by the decision of the voters in the primaries.

It is through its control of the party machine that Big Business dominates politics in America. McCarthy simply has little leverage in the party organization—Kennedy had much more. He alone could have taken the leadership of the Democratic Party from the Johnson-Humphrey forces.

Although handicapped by his own class limitations, by his tendency to vacillate and compromise with reaction, Kennedy's death was a cruel blow to those growing numbers of people who want an end to war and a new direction to both our foreign and domestic policies. His election would have been a blow to the more aggressive and ultra-reactionary imperialist circles represented by the Johnson-Humphrey administration; it would have contributed to a domestic and international climate favoring the effort to get the war ended.

At this point it is impossible to say with any certainty who ordered Kennedy's death. The possibility of a high-level conspiracy cannot be completely discounted. It is an ominous sign that reactionary forces who managed to dominate the administration after the assassination of President Kennedy have strengthened their stranglehold on the Democratic Party through the death of another Kennedy.

But why is this happening in the United States? Does the killing of the Kennedy brothers bear any relation to the rising tide of violence in the country, to the assassination of such Negro leaders as Medgar Evers, Malcolm X, and Dr. Martin Luther King?

Our country has always been the most violent of the Western "Democracies." Its frontier spirit and its widely armed population are often said to be at the root of our nation's bloody traditions. This is of course completely false. The bloodshed that has accompanied every democratic struggle in our country has always been perpetrated by our vicious and ruthless ruling class.

The primary factor which explains the

ability of our ruling class consistently to engage in violence has been the historical failure of the American people to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The system of Jim Crow and Negro oppression, the super-exploitation of Black people, lie at the heart of our violent history. It is a system of brutal exploitation which for its successful operation needs an oppressive machinery of state. The racist ideology which has accompanied this way of life has served to divide and weaken every democratic and working class movement.

One has only to examine the present situation to see this. The police forces in our cities today are something in the nature of standing armies. In New York City the police force numbers 33,000, and other major cities have proportionally similar forces. Their equipment includes tanks, armored carriers, helicopters and a variety of chemical "riot control" devices. Besides the police, each state has its National Guard, specially trained and equipped to deal with "civil disorders."

Racism has made this militarization palatable to large numbers of white people. However, the ruling class has made no covenant to use these forces only against Blacks. They have recently been used against students and peace demonstrators, and it has been made clear that they are prepared to act against "illegal" labor actions.

Two other factors contribute to the recent intensification of violence. One of these is the role which American imperialism has assumed in maintaining the world imperialist system. It has taken on its shoulders the burden of the military defense of the colonial order; it has placed militarism and warfare at the heart of our social life, with the result that glorification of brutality and bloodshed permeates our entire national culture. It has created a massive espionage system which, operating secretly, is completely independent of democratic control. News of the involvement of the CIA in the National Student Association, in a number of other youth organizations and in the labor movement, came as a shock to the people. New evidence linking Oswald, the alleged assassin of President Kennedy, to the CIA, highlights the possibility of such organizations using terror against the growing movement demanding an end to our aggressive foreign policy.

However, perhaps the key element in the

violence and political assassination, lies in the erosion of popular support for the present imperialist, state-monopoly form of rule. The sharpening world crisis of imperialism, exemplified by the U.S. debacle in Vietnam and the growing economic difficulties at home are giving rise to a serious political crisis in our country. Finance capital wants to place the burden of its present economic problems on the people through the introduction of more intense state-monopoly measures. At precisely the moment when it is most in need of political support, monopoly is losing support at an unprecedented rate.

The inability of monopoly to develop a popular base for its war policy, its failure to stifle the Black liberation movement and halt the consistent left trend among intellectuals, students and youth in general, and its declining influence over an ever more restive labor movement, make up the central ingredients of the developing crisis.

The Right has been unable to off-set the Left trend. Monopoly, then, since it appears unable to win popular support for its policies, is left with two alternatives. It can change its policies or it can attempt to stifle the democratic will of the people through violence. Robert Kennedy, who stood for those monopoly interests and who chose the former path, became the victim of that section which opted for the latter. The evil forces that took his life, and that of his brother, are essentially the same as those who struck down America's courageous fighters for Black liberation and social justice.

Now that Kennedy is out of the way, it would take a miracle to prevent Humphrey from getting the Democratic Party nomination. The assumption is that he will face Nixon in November, since Nixon is presently a slight favorite.

However, we do not feel that Nixon represents any significant difference from the present administration. Nor do we feel that the politics of the next four years will be settled once and for all at the ballot box in November. The fight against the reactionary policies of monopoly capital does not take place only once in four years. The fight is a continuous one, and the ability of monopoly to implement policy depends on the strength of the forces opposing it.

Today, we see signs of a third party being built, a party which could give political expression to the growing mass movements and begin to vie for the support of

the 80 per cent of the Democratic electorate that gave their votes to Kennedy and McCarthy. Should this new political form be able to organize and channel the growing dissatisfaction of masses of Americans with the present policies of monopoly, a new political situation could develop very rapidly.

Indeed, the ruling class policy of violence

is having the same effect at home as it is having abroad—bringing into play forces much more powerful than those it seeks to destroy. This is not to say that our situation is easy or that the final outcome is already determined. We must do from within the lair of the beast what the Vietnam freedom fighters are doing in their country.

Sean BRENNIS

Reflections on the "plan and market" problem

WOLFGANG BERGER and OTTO REINHOLD

It is five years since the new economic system of planning and management was introduced in the German Democratic Republic, a long enough time to show that the joint economic conference of the Socialist Unity Party and the Council of Ministers, June 24-25, 1963, charted the right course, sparking economic and political progress. Now, the German Democratic Republic ranks among the top ten industrial countries of the world and has greatly consolidated its position, with the people reaping the benefits of their constructive labor.

Spadework for the successive stages of the new economic system continues under the guidance of our Party, whose Seventh Congress framed fresh measures, recently endorsed by the State Council. One of these pursues the basic idea of socialist economy: an organic fusion of centralized planning and management with responsibility on the part of the socialist producer and equal responsibility for guidance on the part of the local government bodies. The aim is to harmonize centralized planning with planning at factory level. To be effective, this calls for much care. But the rewards will be great, for the enterprises will have a dependable basis for responsible economic activity and could focus the creative energy of their staffs on gearing their work to the interests of society as a whole.

I.

Our new economic measures are based on theoretical research that also engages the attention of economists in the other socialist countries. After all, the main pur-

pose is to forge socialist planning into an effective instrument controlling the economic processes and enabling us to cope with the problems created by the technological revolution. For us Soviet experience and the achievements of Soviet science are of tremendous value.

Our attention is naturally drawn to the views expressed on the plan and market under socialism by economists in the other socialist countries and discussed in various journals, including *World Marxist Review*.

One writer sees the market as an objective economic category studied and influenced through the plan. Yet, as we see it, if the problems of the plan and market were linked, mistakes would be bound to occur. The market is a definite set of economic processes, whereas the plan is an expression of a subjective will, laying down aims, resources to secure them, and the like. Viewed from this angle, we have here a correlation of the objective and subjective.

In this respect, Marxists have a dependable scientific method of analysis, that of materialist dialectics, whose prime requirement it is thoroughly to examine all the interconnections of the particular problem. Incontestably, the market—or, more precisely, commodity-money relations and the law of value—is an economic reality. Just as incontestably, however, the objective, that is, economic, reality, embraces far greater areas than the market. And in planning we deal with the process of reproduction as a whole, not piecemeal. The plan of an enterprise treated as a socialist producer takes into account the entire pro-

cess of reproduction within its walls, and the national economic plan covers the main features and basic proportions of the entire countrywide process. As we see it, therefore, it is not entirely logical to identify the plan with economic reality or reduce the latter concept simply to the market. We would rather say that the tie-up is between the plan and the corresponding economic process of reproduction.

Take a closer look at this economic reality. Is it chaotic, unknowable or governed by definite laws? If by laws, then are they cognizable?

For the Marxist economist, as we see it, it is obvious, first, that definite objective laws operate on the economic scene, secondly, that these laws are cognizable and, thirdly, that in socialist conditions, i.e., after resolving the antagonistic class contradictions and removing the machinery of capitalist competition, we can make use of these laws for the public good. *What this boils down to is that we can run the economic processes consciously, according to plan, by virtue of our knowledge of objective laws.* In a socialist economy, unlike the capitalist, we must therefore reckon with the operation of these laws and the attendant results in all areas, not just the market. In fact, we should make conscious use of them in the preceding stages, too, in determining the trends of economic growth, the growth of science, the technological processes, as well as in material production, etc.

We concede that the plan is an expression of man's will, *but a will that can and must proceed from a grounded appreciation of the objective reality and its determinative laws.* That is why we consider the plan so important, for by applying the objectively existing economic laws of socialism it enables groups of producers to work consciously, for a set purpose.

That our planning is still imperfect and deficient is, of course, not objectively inevitable. *So the task is to develop and improve the system of planning with the aim of gaining the optimum control over the economic processes and to accomplish this by apprehending the objective economic laws (including the law of value).* It appears ill-advised to forego research, to rely on the operation of the market and accept its indications as a solution, modifying the plan "on the march" to suit its whims.

It stands to reason that we in the GDR analyze the demand as accurately as we

can and produce the relevant forecasts as the basis for planning. That, indeed, is why we attach so much importance to proficiency in the realization of our products, in sales at home and abroad.

We pay special attention to market influences on those spheres of social production where the demand is exposed to considerable fluctuations in terms of quality as well as quantity (as, say, the consumer industries). Years ago we realized in theory that the laws of value and commodity-money relations are valid and operative economic categories, and not survivals of capitalism to be cast overboard. Accordingly, the planning of the socialist producers is more realistic and flexible and the appraisal of the prime targets begins at a far earlier stage than marketing (e.g., by comparing targets and results, strict economic accountability, especially at factory level, etc.). This shows that we are taking the influences of the market into due consideration. But that does not make ours a market economy, because we do not treat the market mechanism as the determinative element of our socialist economic system.

What prompts us to view the market in the right perspective as but a part of the economic reality is that the economic laws operate objectively, that is, irrespective of the will and consciousness of men, and under socialism are made to yield benefits through men's activity. While the capitalist cannot calculate and control the results of his work due to the antagonistic contradictions of his environment, this is quite possible in principle in a socialist society despite what some economists say about differences and contradictions prevailing between the interests of the future and today, between various social groups, etc. Socialist society is capable of accommodating those non-antagonistic differences and finding the most favorable relationship between the economic interests of all concerned. It is quite capable of bringing to bear the material and moral incentives that awaken public interest in work that yields the best results for society as a whole and for the individual producer. This is possible, among other things, because the economic system and its principles conform with the socialist system and the interests of society.

That is a trump for us in our economic competition with the imperialists. It orients the workers, technicians, engineers and others on working consciously for higher productivity and lower costs, in which they

have a stake. By reason of the profoundly democratic nature of the planned socialist economy and our ability to concentrate the effort of millions on making the best use of the economic laws, the conscious labor of the working people enables us to attain, as Lenin advised, higher growth rates in labor productivity than those of the capitalist economy.

From this some economists infer a convergence in planning. They contend that planning in the developed capitalist and socialist countries has common features and, particularly, that it is effected through an *actually functioning market*. This serves as a jumping-off-board for attacks on the "metaphysical approach" of those who conclude from the contradiction between the social nature of the productive forces and private capitalist ownership of the means of production that anarchy and planlessness are inevitable in capitalist society.

Need we invoke Marx and Engels to repulse their attacks? We can confine ourselves instead to the opinion of those bourgeois economists who respect the economic realities. Take John K. Galbraith, the U.S. economist, who in his recent book, *The New Industrial Society*, delves into the essence of state-monopoly capitalism, notably that of the United States. Far be it from us to maintain that his is a model analysis. Yet those who think an actually functioning market exists under state-monopoly capitalism would be hard put to it to refute some of Galbraith's arguments. He indicates, for example, that society's intrinsic dynamism, which he calls new-industrial, robs the market of its regulating function, and describes as conservative those economists who fly in the face of the facts and speak of a free market economy.

In fact, the capitalist market has long ceased to be an independent economic entity beyond the influence of the producers. The economic laws implicit in capitalism have caused concentration of production and centralization of capital to a degree that enables the big concerns to manipulate the market and set monopoly and oligopoly prices in the decisive economic areas. Neither can Galbraith be refuted where he says that industrial planning by the U.S. concerns presupposes price control because the industrialist cannot allow prices to be ruled by the chance fluctuations of an uncontrolled market. Indeed the typical parametric forming of prices through the market, described by some economists as a pre-condition of scientific planning, is not es-

entially necessary for the U.S. concerns, which strive for high (capitalist) effectiveness. In fact, no such price-setting machinery exists in any of the imperialist countries.

It goes without saying that we in our socialist environment want a rational price structure, for that would facilitate optimum planning. Indeed, we have our sights set in that direction in the German Democratic Republic. But our view is that this rational price structure will come out of scientific research over a long term based on our increasingly fruitful use of the economic laws.

Why is the "profit-market" machinery no longer able to regulate production and circulation in the imperialist countries? Because, as we see it, the social character of production, accentuated a hundredfold by the technological revolution, calls for solutions on a national scale and in the interest of all society, of which monopoly rule is entirely incapable by reason of private ownership, the competitive struggle and the exploitation in capitalist society. And then there are other contradictions. The specialization and division of labor, for instance, which have increased at a high rate, greatly widen the economic relationships essential for the normal functioning of the reproduction process. Naturally, the role of the individual producer increases. A number of other processes are activated, of which we shall here dwell on but a few. There is no longer any question of a free flow of capital, because basic capital is concentrated to an unprecedented degree. The big enterprises need stable ties with the purveyors of raw materials and other supplies, installations, etc. An aircraft factory, for example, must have a say already during the research and designing stage and on the production of essential metals, engine parts, electronic instruments, etc. In a sense, its say can be decisive, for it cannot wait until it finds the suitable item in the open market. On the other hand, however, before launching production it needs a ready market for its commodity.

And though this occurs in the context of commodity relations, we can no longer identify the latter with the market relations of former times. Outlays of capital are so high that production for an unknown market at prices formed by that market is out of the question.

Production, now closely associated with science, depends on science to an ever growing degree. Yet no such association

can emerge from the spontaneous workings of the market.

The rate of growth of the productive forces is now so high that only long-term forecasts, and certainly not the short-term effects of the market, go into the making of the producer's strategy and economic policy, for ultimately it is forecasts that determine both markets and prices. The above prompts the monopolies, backed by the monopoly state, to devise a system of programming to dampen the elemental effects of the market. Yet the political dominance of the monopolies, capitalist ownership of the means of production and capitalist exploitation set very narrow limits for this state-monopoly regulation. Neither the "profit-market" machinery nor state-monopoly economic regulation can at this point resolve the problems of the technological revolution. The two principles collide head-on, the contradictions are more acute and the instability of the capitalist economic system more marked, which, in turn, generates the monopoly urge for broader authoritarian state intervention.

When some economists contend that certain elements of the capitalist experience are useful to socialist planning, one cannot help asking what experience they mean. Should we in our passage to socialism restore the old, pre-state-monopoly market relations and allow the free play of capital? Yes, if the laws of the market were our only guide. But no one takes this eventuality seriously. For us the sole guideline is to use the political power of the working class and socialist ownership of means of production to gear reproduction to the requirements of the modern productive forces in the interests of the entire people. And specifically for us in the GDR the main problem is to combine correctly centralized government guidance of the basic aspects of social reproduction with the maximum responsibility at factory level.

II.

The motive forces of socialist society and the ways of giving them the maximum impetus are another bone of contention. The question asked is what generates the decisive impulses for the growth of the productive forces—the plan or the market? Many economists give the nod to the market, claiming that the market, not the plan, impels improvement in the technico-economic standard of production and performs the function of economic compulsion. And

wherever the plan performs that role (as in the case of planning by directive) every indicator is inevitably an object of controversy between the central bodies and the factory, an obvious obstacle to scientifically-grounded planning.

Many problems are involved. In our case, the Party and the socialist state offer material incentives to enterprises to give them a stake in making the biggest possible contribution to the national income, i.e., fulfilling their assignments with the highest possible efficiency. Every economic advance is logically associated with increases in incentives, or, wherever necessary, with economic compulsion.

What is the direction of the economic incentive or compulsion? What economic tasks must the socialist enterprises resolve, and what public interests must they guarantee?

The public interest is expressed first and foremost by the main economic law of socialism, which focuses all economic activity on rapid growth and effective use of the national income. However, this general approach assumes a concrete form at every stage, reflected in the national plan, particularly the long term. To be sure, growth of the market and of the pertinent requirements must be accurately analyzed, and taken into account in both the plan and in all economic activity. Yet the market does not determine the likely trend in scientific and technical development, the most desirable structure of the productive forces, scientific research or designing. The optimum economic structure, for example, cannot be deduced from market requirements. Since the market acts as a control instrument only *a posteriori*, any attempt to follow market indications in moulding the optimum structure inevitably causes considerable material and time losses, and is therefore unacceptable to a modern, scientifically organized and guided economy.

Usually it takes long scientific research, with the socialist commodity producers taking part, to determine the optimum structure. The essential thing is to find the most favorable variant. Yet the question of what solution to accept should be settled by centralized means on the basis of objective criteria. The solution should then be introduced into the plan and carried forward under the guidance of the state, including administrative methods.

Our long-term plan is chiefly intended to shape an economic structure most suitable and effective for the GDR. The accent is

on targets that will determine this structure. But pinpointing the tasks and projects, the product or groups of products structurally determinative for the next 10-15 years is something to which the market provides no answer. The only way to get that answer is by research, of which market surveys are but one element. This research will lead us ultimately to the optimum conclusions. No effective economic structure will ever be forged by the operation of the market either under state-monopoly capitalism or socialism.

We could never make proper use of the economic impulses, organize the forms of these impulses or exert economic pressure to make enterprises run more effectively, unless they have a stake in our aims. It is our purpose to produce a system of economic regulation yielding substantial material advantages to enterprises that contribute visibly to the erection of an effective economic structure. Among the measures contemplated are long-term rates of payment to the government for production assets (at first over two years and from 1970 over five), sharing in net profits, providing funds for bonuses and devising new principles for price-setting. The principle that we expect to pay off best is that of full recoupment of all outlays.

Some think that the different and even conflicting interests of the central organs and the enterprises are the main obstacle to scientifically-grounded planning. There are misgivings that the central authorities may prejudice certain factory-level interests. There is also the fairly widespread notion that not one but many centers exist in a national economy.

Growth of interests and how to handle them is indeed highly important. Our Sixth Party Congress, like the Party program, stressed more than five years ago that correspondence of public interest with the interests of individuals, with those of the groups and collectives of socialist society, is the decisive force. The establishment of socialist ownership of the means of production and of the socialist political system has removed the source of any antagonistic contradictions between personal and public interests, laying the groundwork for harmony of all interests, those of society as a whole, of the various groups and of single individuals. Still, it is only a groundwork. Experience has long disproved the simplistic view that harmony evolves automatically.

In the context of a fundamental harmony

there are different levels of interest—public interest, the interest of enterprises and combines and the interest of single individuals. Contradictions, to say nothing of differences, may sometimes arise between them. The enterprise, for example, has a stake in the highest possible profit and the lowest possible deduction to the treasury from its net profit, while the central bodies are interested in high deductions to finance undertakings in the interest of the people as a whole. As we see it, this difference in interests is quite normal, because it prompts joint efforts in overcoming contradictions, spotting the objective requirements imposed by the economic laws and enabling us to stimulate the motive forces of socialist society. Divergent interests and non-antagonistic contradictions may arise between different classes and social groups. The interests of the workers and the peasants, for example, may diverge on the question of prices for farm products. But in contrast to capitalist society, proper guidance by the Party and state may re-align them, removing the contradiction.

What is more, in principle we possess the ability to detect contradictions before they come to the surface, drawing the right conclusions and reducing the damage they may cause.

In this context our policy purposes two aims:

Firstly, to encourage and take into account through the economic system the specific interests of enterprises, groups of enterprises, etc., served, among other things, by the responsibility borne by enterprises, self-financing, the above-mentioned long-term rates, etc. Commodity relations and the law of value play a big role, too. The relationship between enterprises, combines and all other economic units should, therefore, in most emphatic terms, follow the principle of economic accountability. The price-rate principle should supersede all others at factory level in order to bring the material interest of the workers into full play as a motive force of economic growth.

Secondly, to focus government guidance on aligning the various specific interests with the social interest. And by aligning we mean much more than coordinating. This would be inconceivable with more than one decision-making center. If the socialist state allowed the different interests to be geared to the laws of the market, the autonomy of enterprises would grow out of all proportion and come into colli-

sion with the social character of production, atomizing the process of social reproduction, which is unacceptable, because it is bound to affect the general public interest, creating the danger of unemployment and inflation. Centralized guidance by the state has to be of a very high standard to encourage the specific interests of enterprises and their personnel.

That, too, is an object of controversy. While some economists hold that the market alone makes truly scientific planning possible, we believe (and it can be proved) that scientific planning should be based on the objective socialist laws operating in all spheres of the reproduction process.

As we see it, and this applies doubly to a highly developed socialist country, planning and management are a complex scientific process that cannot succeed unless based on socialist democracy and effective employment on the national and local scales of such levers as economic accountability, operational research and computer techniques.

In a socialist society economic growth is a continuous Party-guided process. The introduction of the new economic system in the German Democratic Republic, begun five years ago, has yielded considerable experience. We have worked methodically for improvements. And more measures are contemplated to raise the standard of planning and management.

It could not be more obvious that the dynamics of the technological revolution will go up rapidly over the coming decades. This means that structural changes will also be more rapid in the economy as a whole and in its branches. These will shape the reproduction process. It is, therefore, the object of planning to take in hand and guide structural development and all

the social problems entailed. Whereas forecasting will gain still more importance as time goes on, planning and management by the central bodies will concentrate on producing a highly effective structural policy, with the long-term plan as the main instrument of guidance.

The way to this is paved by planning for all products and central control over the production programs related to the structurally determinative products or groups of products. On the one hand, this implies a fairly substantial concentration of planning on just a few basic areas. On the other, it means overall guidance, in line with the structurally determinative tasks, of the entire process of production and reproduction. The long-term rates mentioned earlier play a decisive role in this structural policy.

The system of centralized planning is tied in organically with the greater responsibility of enterprises and groups of enterprises. Therefore, the problems of factory-level planning and management gain in significance.

To sum up, socialist economic planning is not simply government planning of the basic proportions. What it also implies is social production, management and economic growth on the basis of the socialist ownership of the means of production in the interests of the working class and all people. Centralized guidance of social reproduction and the scientifically justified activity of the people are two substantive features of planned socialist economy. The new quality of economic planning is therefore expressed through its more distinctly democratic nature, following from the essence of the social ownership of the means of production and with the scientific standard of the plans rising visibly at all levels.

Fiftieth anniversary of Lenin's "The immediate tasks of the Soviet government"

LEONID SHKARENKOV

The debate with the Left Communists in the Russian Communist Party early in 1918 went far beyond the issue of war and peace. It concerned the ways and means of building socialism, the tempo of the world revolutionary process and its difficulties. Lenin wrote *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government* by way of a reply to the Russian Left Communists, just as somewhat later he wrote "*Left-Wing Communism — An Infantile Disorder*" against the European "Lefts."

Two approaches to building socialism emerged—one marked by the revolutionary resolve to work over a long term for the ultimate aim and the other by phrase-mongering and a "lofty resolve" that overlooked the existing realities and correlation of class forces. "Magnificent, catching and intoxicating," a *Pravda* article commented, "but impracticable. That is what revolutionary phrase-mongering amounts to—an old story all too frequently accepted as the latest novelty."

In the spring of 1918 the Soviet Republic gained a short (and precarious) respite from war and devoted itself to peaceful upbuilding. Lenin looked far ahead. In his *Immediate Tasks* he spoke of constructive work, describing it as the essential purpose of any socialist revolution by the working majority aspiring to independent historical activity, and while the "Left Communists" stressed the "possible collapse of the Russian revolution" under the pressure exerted by the imperialist powers, he gave thought to averting collapse and taking advantage

of the contradictions and antagonisms inevitable between imperialists.

In brief outline, his plan of action was as follows: make the most of the imperialist contradictions but rely chiefly on yourself so long as no revolution has occurred in the West; learn to succeed by good administration; win over the bourgeois specialists; reckon with the fact that the country's economy is largely peasant; do not reject certain compromises, and encourage the initiative of the people, notably the workers.

"Thanks to the peace which has been achieved—despite its extremely onerous character and instability—the Russian Soviet Republic has gained an opportunity to concentrate its efforts for a while on the most important and most difficult aspect of the socialist revolution, namely, the task of organization." This is the opening sentence in *The Immediate Tasks (Collected Works, Vol. 27, p. 237)*. And Lenin returns to the idea time and again, showing that the stress on organizational and economic tasks follows logically from the Communist Party's fight for power. Once the majority of the people is persuaded that the program and tactics of the Party are correct, and once political power is won, organization gains top priority. This would hold true for all other parties fighting for the socialist goal, Lenin pointed out.

Lenin held that during the transition from capitalism to socialist society political tasks were secondary to economic ones. And that is a point of immense importance.

He went back time and again to this specific feature, which sets socialist society apart in the history of civilization. He was opposed to the Soviet press copying the make-up of bourgeois-democratic papers and borrowing their political phraseology, attacked anarcho-syndicalist trends, separatism and parochialism and ridiculed concentration on purely political talk at which the Left Communists were past masters.

The petty-bourgeois element with its small property outlook, (I'll grab what I can, and the devil take the hindmost) should be combated by conscious proletarian labor discipline. How to attain discipline was, Lenin said, what preoccupied the Socialists. But working out new principles of discipline is a long-term assignment. Lenin therefore called attention to the need for "the strictest control by the public and by the state over the measure of work and consumption." He referred to this before the Bolsheviks came to power, and in the spring of 1918 stressed again that accounting and control was the fundamental question facing the socialist revolution. "Lack of accounting and control in the production and distribution of goods," he wrote, "means the death of the rudiments of socialism" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 254). From the revolutionary democratic measure that it was before the October Revolution, workers' control was to develop into state accounting and control. Lenin held this essential for socializing production and raising labor productivity.

That was the time when Lenin insisted on a plan to assure a balanced approach in nationalizing industry. In contrast to the Left Communists, he opposed "immediate socialization," saying that "confiscation alone leads nowhere, as it does not contain the element of organization, of accounting for proper distribution." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 107-108.)

The main difficulty was to find ways of exercising sweeping control over production and distribution, essential for the survival of tens of millions of people.

For the young Soviet Republic, the pioneer of socialism, every step was an experiment. *The Immediate Tasks* contained the first conjectures regarding the appropriate methods of economic management and forms of state control. It noted, for example, that the consumer cooperatives, which even prior to the Revolution had more than 10 million members, could be an effective vehicle of control and distribution; it at-

tached importance to the banks, which, Lenin said, could function under socialism as centers of public accounting. It may be of interest to note on this score that at present, too, the question of using banks as agencies of economic control and regulation is being studied in many socialist countries, for the banks are gaining added responsibilities as new methods of management are taking root. Lenin also suggested an offensive against those who hoarded large sums of money, withdrawing them from circulation and concealing them from state control, and proposed the provisional measure of concentrating all bank-note reserves in the State Bank or its branches.

Those were times when some prattled about "abolishing money," others about "a withering away of commodity-money relations" in the transitional period. So it may be of interest to see what Lenin said on this score in the original version of *The Immediate Tasks*. "It is absolutely impossible," he indicated, "to dispense with banknotes or to replace them with new ones in short order during the transition from capitalist to socialist society." Nowadays, this issue, though solved theoretically as well as practically by Lenin in the early years of the Soviet Republic, is again raised by theoreticians who, enamored of Left phraseology, entirely deny commodity-money relations during the building of socialist society. However, no one will succeed in repealing objective economic laws by any arbitrary decree.

At different stages, it is true, socialist economic planning, the new commodity-money relations, the market laws, their connections and interactions, and their role in economic management, assumed different forms. At present, too, economists are looking for ways of turning to account the commodity-money mechanism and the socialist market. Practice has shown that the commodity-money mechanism broadens as the productive forces grow in socialist society, especially when building communism.

The economic reforms in most European socialist countries bear this out. True, in every country they have their own features (some very distinctive), but all pursue the same aim of making social production more effective, putting the socialist economic laws to better use and activating new stimuli. Control over production and distribution and achievement of higher pro-

ductivity — of which Lenin spoke in the early years of the Soviet state — are now handled in a different context, geared to the needs of the socialist industrial society.

Efforts to improve the centralized planning go hand in hand with the economic reforms. Initiative by the enterprises is encouraged to the utmost. The reforms create good opportunities for establishing the desirable balance of demand and supply — a matter of constant concern and prime importance for the economy and the people. The economic worth of enterprises is now measured chiefly by their marketing capacity, with the consumer exerting a direct influence on production, which pushes to the fore the quality factor.

Among the immediate tasks envisaged by Lenin was a try at piece-rate wages, gearing incomes to performance and pushing up consumption for those who showed better results in production. Past experience in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries proves that it is essential to combine revolutionary enthusiasm with material incentive and economic accountability.

Lenin, by the way, was the first to postulate the specific importance of price, profit, credit and wage categories in a socialist economy. In many socialist countries the efficiency indicator of enterprises is measured by profit. "What we want," wrote Rezs Nyers, leading member of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, "is to make the growth of enterprises conditional on their profit and, furthermore, to relate to profit the individual incomes of their employees" (*World Marxist Review* 1966, No. 10). Economists are preoccupied with price formation. Nearly all the European socialist countries are renovating their price systems and bringing them into line with the actual socially necessary labor expenditure and the home and foreign demand and supply.

These and other trends sparked by the economic reform are designed to harmonize centralized planning and broad initiative, which accords with the principle of democratic centralism in the economy, of which Lenin wrote 50 years ago that "it should be clearly understood how far removed democratic centralism is from bureaucratic centralism, on the one hand, and from anarchism, on the other." Lenin's ideas concerning building the new society are now being projected to the changed conditions. Theories that jettison commodity-

money relations in socialist society and those proclaiming the market as the next thing to being the "foundation" of socialism, fall far short of the facts.

* * *

Among the many problems raised in *The Immediate Tasks*, Lenin singled out as particularly important the task of harmonizing persuasion with compulsion during the transition from capitalism to socialism.

The possible forms of compulsion, he said, depended chiefly on the forms of resistance by the bourgeoisie. It was not until the counter-revolutionary plots and risings occurred that the Soviet Government resorted to severe measures of suppression. Important, too, is Lenin's reminder that the form of compulsion also depended on the level of development of the revolutionary class. Once someone slips into bourgeois-anarchist ways, he forgets the rock-bottom fact that socialist statehood cannot exist without elements of compulsion and that theories designed to abolish all elements of compulsion will only undermine the socialist state without which no socialist society is conceivable. It stands to reason that this does not apply to complete communism.

The section on the development of Soviet organization in *The Immediate Tasks* recommends carefully recording, studying and systematizing all steps taken to draw the people into the practical work of administration. As Lenin saw it, emulation movements should occupy a prominent place and more extensive public information should hold up economic problems to public scrutiny, stressing the power of example. At present, the economic reforms pushing forward initiative and socialist democracy, Lenin's ideas on this score appear more valid than ever.

Incontestably, the greater independence of the enterprises and the greater stake each employee has in the result of his work, accentuate the role of managers and the performance of rank-and-file workers. "The new economic system places more worth on independent and energetic managers conscious of their responsibility, searching for new solutions and who, after weighing the pros and cons, are not afraid to take risks. It encourages managers who use their mandate to best advantage and have the knack of welding large collectives, guiding them and inspiring their work." That is the opinion of Wolfgang Berger

(*World Marxist Review*, 1965, No. 2) of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Emil Khristov, the Bulgarian economist, says: "Since every worker now has a stake in the economic activities of his enterprise (and is at the same time responsible for them) . . . he should be given a say in determining the economic process with the aim of improving it. The workers must take a hand in running their enterprise, contributing all their creative energy" (*World Marxist Review*, 1967, No. 7).

Beyond question, the greater the initiative of employees, the greater their sense of responsibility, the more varied are the forms and methods of control from below, essential, to use Lenin's phrase, in order repeatedly and tirelessly to weed out bureaucracy.

In the capitalist countries, of course, workers' control means something else entirely, being a new form of struggle for socialism.

Most West European Communist parties and those in the United States, Canada and a few other countries, hold that in the present conditions, with state-monopoly capitalism a permanent feature of the capitalist economic structure, they must avail themselves of the contradictions of state-monopoly capitalism and of the material and other preconditions it creates for the passage to socialism. They campaign for workers' control at all levels, linking their efforts to this end in the economic sphere with the fight for political democracy, each democratic reform being viewed as another step closer to socialism. It may be useful to recall, therefore, that Lenin underscored the complexity of the workers' tasks in the developed capitalist countries, and in *The Immediate Tasks* he expressed the view that while it would be much more difficult to begin the socialist revolution there, it would be easier to go on with it.

The difficulties of the developing countries are of a different order. "A backward country can easily begin . . . but for it to continue demands of that country a hundred thousand times more circumspection, caution and endurance," Lenin observed, his warning being doubly valid today, when many of the developing countries are opting for the non-capitalist way. Government must lean on the people to counteract possible distortions and safeguard the country from unforeseen contingencies, reactionary plots and military coups.

* . *

Tracing the tortuous passage to socialism, Lenin held that it needs specialists and technicians. His allusion was to the bourgeois intellectuals most of whom at first disavowed the October Revolution. But Soviet Russia, where the imperialist blockade and boycott dashed all hopes of effective aid from abroad, while it would take years to develop a new, people's intelligentsia, had to "digest and re-educate" the old intelligentsia, for, as Lenin put it, it would be "ludicrously stupid to regard this drawing in of the intelligentsia as some kind of weakening of the Soviet system, some kind of inadmissible compromise with the bourgeoisie" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 214).

For many intellectuals the decision to work with the Soviet government was not an easy one to make. Ultimately, however, hundreds of thousands joined actively in building socialism. The bourgeois specialist, Lenin remarked later, knows that there is no return to the old society, that he can work alongside the Communists, who lead the masses and command their absolute confidence. The intelligentsia's acceptance of socialism amounts to its acceptance of the working-class position and to a fusion of its basic interests with those of the workers and the strata led by the working class. All theories fencing off the intelligentsia from the workers and magnifying caste privileges are harmful to both the intelligentsia and the socialist cause.

The role of the intelligentsia in socialist society derives from its close bond with the people, the working class and the peasants, and will no doubt increase in this time of technological revolution, with science turning progressively into an immediate productive force.

In the capitalist countries, too, the condition of the intelligentsia, its influence and revolutionary potential have changed. Sections of it are moving closer to the working class by reason of its place in production and its interests. It is now generally acknowledged that the working class in these countries is being joined by people of other than manual labor. In effect, it is being joined by technical specialists and sections of white-collar workers. Generally speaking, the middle strata in town and countryside are gravitating rapidly towards the working class in the fight against the omnipotence of the monopolies.

This expansion of the social base of the

anti-imperialist struggle is bound to reflect on methods. "We must know how to change our methods of fighting the enemy," Lenin pointed out, "to suit changes in the situation," which is as serviceable a principle today as in the past in dealing with the possible approaches to many a difficult problem. Now that objective possibilities exist for broader social alliances, the Communist parties in the capitalist countries are rallying all democratic and progressive forces round the working class. The Communists are striving to merge the extensive revolutionary aspirations of the intelligentsia and students in a single anti-monopoly stream, and effect their junction with the

working class. With the present balance between socialism and imperialism, large sections of the people in the developing countries, including intellectuals, administrators, military officers and the student youth are gravitating towards revolution.

* * *

The experience of the Soviet Republic and the legacy of Lenin's thought covers so much ground, so many different methods of approach to the tasks of the socialist revolution, that all who participate in the revolutionary fighting and in the building of our time find in them useful and important elements.

New situation, new problems

(Fourth Congress of Sudanese Communist Party)

ABDEL KHALIG MAHGOU

By its very nature, the Fourth Congress differed from the previous congresses held since the Party was founded in 1946-47. In discussing its importance, both for the Party and the revolutionary movement, and the new features that it brought to the surface, it is best to begin with a brief description of the background against which it was held.

The 11 years since the Third Congress* saw many changes in the conditions and forms of the revolutionary movement. There were also major changes in world affairs, the international labor movement and the national-liberation movement, and our Party has drawn on this valuable experience.

The Third Congress established that, with the winning of political independence, the national-democratic revolution had entered a new stage, posing new problems for the mass movement. The Congress concentrated on finding solutions for them, for if the Party was to stand at the head of the movement it would have to modify its methods, leadership and contacts with the masses.

The Third Congress endeavored to assess the alignment of class forces in this new stage of the national-democratic revolution. But at that time the forces that could make a significant contribution to the revolution had not yet reached political maturity, though they were united in the anti-colonial front.

True, the post-independence national-lib-

eration movement set itself certain social goals. The idea of democratic development found vigorous support in the working class and among intellectuals. This could be seen in the campaign for agrarian reform. But democratic development was not the dominant idea of the movement, which still clung to the slogan of "national freedom," i.e., political independence as the ultimate goal. This is explained by the fact that the majority of the population was still influenced by tribal, bourgeois and religious leaders.

But the class structure was gradually changing. At the time of the Third Congress the country was still under colonial rule; now it is face to face with neo-colonialism. The Sudanese market has been thrown open to West German capital, and American capital has been making inroads through loans, aid and under the signboard of international organizations. With the disintegration of colonialism, which obstructed economic and social development in order to fortify its dominant position, new opportunities arose for national capital.

This found reflection in the class composition of our society and confronted the revolutionary movement and the Communist Party with entirely new problems. After independence, the Party used diverse forms in the fight to prevent political and economic neo-colonialist penetration.

We led the campaign against the Eisenhower doctrine in 1957, exposed the real purpose of American aid in 1958 and, in the years of the military junta, led the people against neo-colonialist economic penetration. But the struggle had to be

*The Third Congress was held in February 1956 and the Fourth was scheduled for 1958, but could not be held because of the military coup and the terror against the progressive forces. It met in October 1967.

explained theoretically, accumulated experience had to be generalized before a Marxist appraisal could be made of neo-colonialism and the part it plays in the Sudan.

The Fourth Congress studied these problems and came to the following conclusions:

—first, new forms of colonialism are replacing the weakening old-time colonialism;

—second, both in its economic and political forms, neo-colonialism is the chief menace to the Sudan's national development. The principal contradiction of Sudanese life at the present stage of the national-democratic revolution is between neo-colonialism and the people;

—third, neo-colonialism is exerting a definite influence on class relationships, the class struggle, the orientation of the revolutionary movement, and on the revolutionary process.

The Fourth Congress established that neo-colonialism's chief purpose in Sudan was to prevent consummation of the national-democratic revolution and impose on the country a pattern of restricted capitalism. For this neo-colonialism uses every means at its disposal to minimize the role of the public sector and stimulate capitalist elements in various branches of agriculture, industry and trade.

The Congress thus posed the problem of neo-colonialism, in all its facets, as the chief problem of the revolutionary movement. This makes it incumbent on the Communist Party to study neo-colonialism in depth, the forms of its penetration, etc. But the Party has also to build a firm front against neo-colonialism, and not by issuing vague political slogans, but by formulating a specific program based on a searching analysis of every aspect of neo-colonialist policy as it affects the Sudan.

No such theoretical analysis came from the Third Congress.

But neo-colonialist activity and the effort to foster capitalist development, albeit within a limited framework, make it obligatory for the revolutionary movement to elucidate the theoretical and practical questions involved. This applies, first and foremost, to the problem of the national bourgeoisie, which was discussed at the Fourth Congress. But this is a complex problem and it is not easy to produce a general formula showing the role of the national bourgeoisie in our country. At any rate, this could not be done on the basis of general theoretical propositions alone.

Nor is it merely a matter of finding a Marxist interpretation of the role of the national bourgeoisie. We need conclusions based on a constructive study of the economic position in Sudan. And this should begin with a survey of the economic development and of the interacting economic factors. The next step is a scientific examination of available statistics to show how far capitalism has developed in the Sudan.

Colonialism hampered industrial development, with the result that most of local investment went into agriculture. In this the Sudan differs from other ex-colonies—Egypt and India, for instance—where colonialism facilitated the rise and expansion of light industry. But the only conclusion we drew, premised entirely on general propositions, was that these agricultural investments were of a semi-feudal character. No attempt was made to analyze their structure and the production relations.

The Fourth Congress, however, pointed out that these heavy investments in agriculture were the pre-condition and basis for capitalist development. The Sudan has no national capital in the traditional understanding, that is, capital formed in trade and used to build an industrial structure. In our country capital is often bound up with pre-capitalist social relations. And native capital, both in size and character, cannot play a decisive part in capitalist development. It is too weak, too rudimentary, and it will take some time for it to assert itself as a special force. This leaves the field open to foreign capital, which has been flowing into the country, bringing with it trained personnel, technical equipment, etc.

The revolutionary movement is, of course, directed against neo-colonialist infiltration and for more favorable development conditions. But that does not mean that the private sector and native capital are capable of major investments and can eliminate dependence on foreign capital. This creates a rather complex situation for the revolutionary movement in its criticism of the relations between Sudanese capital and foreign interests. We should not oversimplify by taking the attitude that every instance of native capital associating with foreign capital is bound to produce a comprador bourgeoisie.

The sources of local capital formation are in agriculture. Consequently, because of uneven economic development, it be-

comes necessary to study the social stratum operating in this area. For, closely linked with backward, even tribal, elements, it has concentrated much of the country's wealth and is the main source of investment in capitalist enterprise. But this stratum is by no means uniform; it includes a large group still living in pre-capitalist conditions.

It is safe to say that the assessment given by the Fourth Congress is only an approximate one and requires further elaboration. But the Congress took a long step forward by abandoning the old, lifeless formulas in dealing with the problem of capitalist development.

The program it approved describes the national bourgeoisie as a class before which the door to revolutionary activity stands open but which so far has no political organization of its own. The important thing now is to analyze the class anatomy of existing political parties and their degree of contact with one another and the people.

This problem was objectively and comprehensively examined at the Fourth Congress. This is an area in which the Communist Party can draw on the experience it accumulated in the fight against British imperialism. The Sudan has entered the highest stage of the national-democratic revolution, and that alone should prompt the party to act more vigorously, especially now that the role of the bourgeoisie is diminishing.

The Congress also formulated a practical policy towards the national bourgeoisie. It stressed the need for a clear program of revolutionary activity that takes into account the objective situation and the long-range perspective and does not try to bypass national capital and the contribution it is making to the country's development, and regards the national bourgeoisie as a social force interested in national democratic development. *That, essentially, is the real position of the Communist Party vis-a-vis the national bourgeoisie.* We go no further than that—we study the position of the national bourgeoisie in the economy and the political movement and ways and means of its cooperation within the national-democratic front.

The Communist Party is consistently following the program adopted at the Fourth Congress, which defines the present stage of the movement and indicates the main enemy of the revolution.

Our efforts to bring the masses to the fore in the national-democratic struggle

and wrest the initiative from the bourgeoisie, do not mean that the Party's past strategy was wrong. From its inception, the Party urged working-class leadership; now this has become a practical necessity, for the revolution has entered a new stage and the masses clearly want change and social progress.

It would be dangerous for the revolutionary movement if, in these conditions, the Communist Party were not to change its tactics, which fully accorded with earlier conditions, when the movement was virtually controlled by the bourgeoisie and elements that embodied the backwardness of our society. We should not hesitate to bring the revolutionary masses into the leadership of the national-democratic struggle.

This is a difficult task. We will have to counter ideological pressure, overcome ingrained ways of thinking, even bourgeois influence on Party members, and give the whole Party a much more solid Marxist grounding.

In the course of preparations for the Fourth Congress and at the Congress itself, we closely examined two fundamental problems: the theoretical problems of the Sudanese revolution, and what we call the organizational line.

There was much controversy over the first question after the Third Congress, and much effort was put into examining Sudanese realities and theoretical aspects of the Sudanese revolution from the standpoint of dialectical and historical materialism and Marxism generally.

At the time of the Third Congress the central question was how to animate the revolutionary struggle in the Sudan. In solving it, the Party did not apply Marxism dogmatically, either in its practical and theoretical work, or in framing its program and training its cadres. We can say without exaggeration that the Party consistently called for examination of the distinctive features of the Sudanese revolution, for creative application of the spirit, rather than the letter, of Marxism.

And in this we have the explanation of the various forms of Communist activity from the early fifties and up to the Third Congress in February 1956. The Party was concerned that its program should not be made up of set formulas and dogmas. Instead, it applied the Marxist method to its practical revolutionary work and the training of the Party cadres. It worked perseveringly for close contact with the masses,

never feared to test the new, but always on the basis of Marxism.

As a result, the Marxist trend prevailed in the controversy over the Party's approach to the problems raised by the Sudanese revolution. The Third Congress examined the diverse aspects of revolutionary struggle, weighing the positive and negative factors and drawing attention to mistakes and miscalculations. It thus provided the prerequisites for the overall conclusions embodied in the Central Committee report to the Fourth Congress.

The general conclusions are more progressive than those of the Third Congress, though that, too, was a success for our Party line and program despite mistakes and errors of judgment.

The main thing now is to explain the issues to the people and carry through our main revolutionary strategy and tactics, applying Marxist theory in our practical struggle and, what is more, injecting into it Marxist thought and defining its orientation. It is time to stop speaking about there being "no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory" and paraphrasing general Marxist theses in our theoretical work. The revolutionary movement must fuse with Marxist theory in all our practice. We would then be right in saying that Marxism is intimately linked with the grass-roots facts in our country, and is not a mere tendency rejecting routine and servile bookishness.

The Fourth Congress marked a distinct change in our approach. From now on we shall act on the general propositions of the Congress concerning the problems of the Party and the revolution. For our study to be fruitful and for the Congress conclusions to be properly assimilated by the Party and the revolutionary movement, it is essential: a) for the Central Committee to be in the van of the process, b) investigate and develop the conclusions of the Congress, and not depart from what has been unanimously approved by the Party and expressed by its members over the past 11 years, and c) constantly to bear in mind that the Congress conclusions summing up the practical work of the past period are supported by the Party and its organizations, at all levels.

Our Party has old and new cadres, people who joined the Party before and after October 1964. This poses problems. Our ideological work must be of the highest standard; all subjective struggles would but impair our progress. Democratic central-

ism is a compulsive need to ensure that all members join in the common effort. The Party branch is where most of our work is done. It is the branch that submits recommendations, and should not therefore merely reflect the attitude of its particular leader.

We prepared thoroughly for our Congress. Meetings and discussions were held concerning the organizational line. The theoretical results obtained are reflected in the basic documents of the Congress.

It would be wrong to think that all propositions adopted on the organizational problem were mere "evidence" of work done. An earnest and successful effort was made to apply Marxism to the problems of our country.

It was no mere mechanical statistical operation to count the number of teachers and factory workers sent by the Party to work among the peasants, determining how we could extend our influence among them. It revealed that Marxist ideas are taking root, and showed in particular that the Party has gained a firmer hold among the peasants.

This preparatory work also revealed that the Party understood the link between Marxism and revolutionary activity. In the years of our ideological struggle, the Party rejected routinism in all its forms. The lively discussions on organizational matters at Party meetings showed that our line was correct.

Most Party members would not accept pure theory as an article of faith. Neither did they reject it for rejection's sake. What they wanted was to face up to the basic problems at the level of the local branches.

As I see it, that was part of the ideological struggle, involving a large number of our members. Unlike the preparations for previous congresses, this time the work was objective and calm. And for a number of reasons. To begin with we have many years of practical work behind us, and our ideas have stood the test; so did our policy, our approach to the masses, and our Party building policy.

Furthermore, there was no internal struggle as had been the case before the Second Congress, when the Party fought for unity in the midst of a general discussion between two distinct trends, leading finally to a split.

There was the essential modicum of ideological unity concerning strategy and tactics, and argument took place well within the limits of this unity based on ob-

jective, material factors and on the Party's experience in combating dissident groups.

Our task now is to accomplish two things: first, enlist more intellectuals from our midst to work as teachers of Marxist theory in the branches and as specialists in the different areas so badly needed by the people's movement, and, second, to enlist more workers from among our members for work in those branches concerned with the peasantry.

In the fifties, the student movement helped to enliven the peasant movement. Now the order of the day is not simply to enliven the peasant movement, but to deepen it and raise the more serious problems: problems of class struggle in the countryside, problems of the democratic front, the problem of permanent revolutionary and Party centers and the problem of integrating farm workers with the industrial working class. This calls for people with their fingers on the pulse of village life, and people with a working-class background seem best equipped for this work. Extending the sphere of activity for our working-class members will also accentuate the class character of our Party and promote our Marxist ideology. This is also important in view of the growth of the revolutionary struggle, confirming the fact that the role of the workers in our country has increased.

While preparing for Congress, the Party covered much ground in resolving an essential problem, that of setting up Party and revolutionary centers among the peasants and in the traditional sector.

Previously this had been a stumbling block, though the matter had a bearing on the Party's ability to head the revolution and build up a democratic alliance. We tried various approaches: Communist students carried out revolutionary work in their villages during the vacations; so too did some of our intellectuals employed in various agencies; we also tried sending comrades, chiefly students, to do full-time Party work, but this proved successful in just one province. The role of teachers, of groups of workers and of youth organizations has grown. The important thing is that the town provides revolutionary leadership to the countryside, that the Party knows the problems of the peasants and can organize effective centers to conduct revolutionary work.

Whatever the conclusions we have drawn on the strength of our headway in organizational matters, we must give thought to the

cadres who will put them into practice. We must take stock of our experience and not jump to conclusions until we have done so. It is obvious that the "organizational line" issue was highly important for our Party, sparking an effort to improve our work among the people, and to enliven our activity. What it entails is democratic centralism, criticism and self-criticism, and thoughtful selection of functionaries.

Congress looked into the problems of inner-Party life with the purpose of improving it and enabling the Party to keep abreast of the revolutionary process in the country. The problem of inner-Party life is a complex one. The essential thing is for the Party to cope with its tasks in the new conditions, finding new forms of work. Technicians are becoming part of the working class. As a result, the leading role in the revolutionary movement is passing from the groups that stood in the van formerly to other sections of the working class. The new generation has none of the traditions forged in our early class battles, and its class consciousness has still to be cultivated. The intelligentsia is now in a better position to do its educational work than before, when it had to concern itself directly with political matters. But it is a vortex of different ideological trends that never affected the older generation of Communist intellectuals, because in the latter's time Marxism was only beginning to spread in our country and hundreds of intellectuals thirsted for it. The new trends that appeared at the time of the military junta (November 1958-October 1964) prevail chiefly among the youth, as distinct from the time when the Communist Party was itself young and, in effect, essentially a youth movement.

I should like to point out, firstly, that the new conditions of our inner-Party life compel us to spread the Marxist ideology in our ranks. That is done chiefly by combating abstract ideas and routine. When battling isolationism, especially in the autumn of 1964, we conquered routine and stagnation in our strategic and tactical political work. We also fought the new sectarianism, another isolationist trend. However, we have not yet embraced all aspects of the revolutionary work influencing the growth of our society; we have not broken the blockade, nor extended the scale of our work. Yet what we are doing in this field is based on firm foundations and benefits from a variety of sources—the cultural revival, the reconstruction, etc.

We can safely say that the problems examined by the Congress add up to a program of inner-Party struggle. It will not take the form of a mere discussion, for it centers on the compulsive need for practical changes in all spheres. This dual form of our ideological struggle, as noted by the Fourth Congress, is a special feature bred by the new conditions. Hence the necessity, in the interests of the revolutionary movement, to do away with this duality, to stamp it out without hesitation against the backdrop of political unity, which we should not use to disguise the trends acting as a brake on our work.

Secondly, the principle of democratic centralism must be fully applied, especially in the branches, where accumulated energy was denied an outlet due to the patronage from above. Not only must we discuss and elucidate the problems raised by the Fourth Congress in the local branches; we must develop the latter into centers bearing full responsibility for their revolutionary activity. Local initiative must never be hemmed in by detailed instructions tantamount to interference on the excuse that the branches cannot cope with their affairs. That would breed discontent, especially among members active since October 1964. Here is how matters stand: is it better for members to learn and commit mistakes in the learning, or for things to go "right" because run from above, with the Party branch an idle bystander? Should we accept the experience of the fighters in our ranks with all their mistakes or cover the ground all over again?

The Fourth Congress scored a distinct victory on the main issue raised by the Party in the summer of 1966: the trend of our revolutionary work. There was vacillation, certain tendencies clashed, and some branches went so far as to step down, even discontinue, their work. That Rightist deviation, which bowed to the difficulties of revolutionary work, was overcome, the Communist Party retaining its position in

the center of the revolutionary movement. However, the trend keeps recurring and the Party has to fight it again and again. Sometimes, it recurs in the form of liberalist attacks on the Leninist organizational principles, drawing a line of distinction between the leaders and the masses, turning fruitful polemics into a clash of personalities and substituting sectarian organization for a mass Communist party.

Essentially, the liberalist trend reflects petty-bourgeois tendencies and ideas, retarding inner-Party development. The fight against it, asserting the Leninist principles of inner-Party growth, is part of the struggle against the deviations that first appeared in the summer of 1966, and part of the effort to improve the process of inner-Party growth, enabling us, as recommended by Congress, to exert a sound influence on all theoretical and practical activities, helping us to enroll a large number of capable people and giving the Party new strength as it tackles the tasks of the new, higher stage of our national-democratic revolution.

The success of the Fourth Congress is moderated by limitations that the Congress had itself defined, especially in relation to the possibilities and perspectives of the decayed parliamentary system. Congress pointed out that the present regime is bent on preventing the Party from performing its important mission. The Communists must mobilize the masses to consummate the national-democratic revolution. It must follow closely the changes in the masses and the growth of a revolutionary crisis in our country.

The present situation offers new opportunities for revolutionary work. The Party must work hard in the ideological and practical spheres, raise the standard of its revolutionary work, organize revolutionary Party centers and, last but not least, unite all the social forces favoring revolutionary change, thus promoting the growth of the revolutionary movement.

The Israeli-U.S. alliance in action

SALIBA KHAMIS

The time-bomb of a new military conflict has been planted in the Middle East. Far from being resolved, the complicated crisis of Israeli-Arab relations has become sharper, and, if not settled, will present a clear menace to world peace.

Imperialism is heightening the tension in the Middle East. It is creating for its junior partner, the Israeli extremists, the necessary preconditions for a new gamble. The idea is to crush the Arab national-liberation movement and build up an active cold-war center and operational base against the Soviet Union and the East European socialist countries.

Lavishly supported by the U.S. and other Western imperialists, Israel continues to occupy Arab territory in gross violation of U.N. decisions. The exodus of Arab refugees runs at tens of thousands. This is due to the Israeli occupation policy, deliberately aimed at creating intolerable conditions for the Arabs by a combination of terror, harassment and constant provocation on the cease-fire line.

For years now, the U.S. imperialists have been lavishly investing in building up Israeli militarism. The latter's present aggression is but one element in Washington's global strategy, in which the Middle East is cast in a special role: it accounts for 60 per cent of the world's oil reserves and is the crossroads of communications between Europe, Africa and Asia. That, in fact, is the basis of the sinister alliance between the Israeli extremists and U.S. imperialism.

At a recent news conference Defense Minister Moshe Dayan admitted that the interests of his government and of imperialism coincided. "I believe," he said, "that the strengthening of the U.S. position in

the Middle East is to our advantage, and the loss of U.S. influence in Jordan to our disadvantage."

This unity with the colonialists and imperialist forces in the Middle East casts a revealing light on the dangerous role of the Israeli leaders. For their policy is aimed not only against the Middle East national-liberation movement and progressive forces, but also against world peace. This collusion was confirmed by Prime Minister Eshkol during his visit to Prime Minister Wilson in January; Eshkol remarked that he was "deeply concerned over the withdrawal of British troops from the Persian Gulf area." And also this revealing remark by Eshkol in a statement to the *Jerusalem Post* (Dec. 29, 1967): "My visit to the United States three years ago laid the foundation for our victory in the six-day war." That should leave no doubt in anyone's mind about the part the imperialists played in organizing the June 1967 aggression.

One of the tragic things about the war was the success of Israeli official propaganda in misleading Israeli public opinion and inculcating the idea that the war was being fought in self-defense. The propaganda machine whipped up a war psychosis. The jingo agitation of extremist Arab nationalists was adroitly exploited to put through this argument and, for a time, build up the necessary support within the country and abroad for dexterously masked expansionist and reactionary plans.

Falsification and distortion of the facts are still one of the chief propaganda techniques of imperialism. And it is being skilfully used to lull the vigilance of the peoples.

But it is clear that the June war was the result of Israeli policy and not, as official

propaganda claims, of "peaceful intentions," or of the noisy chauvinist threats by some Arab extremists.

Every war is the continuation of politics by armed strength. Hence, the causes of the prolonged Arab-Israeli conflict should be sought in the Israeli rulers' pro-imperialist Zionist policy. It finds expression in the total disregard of the national and historical rights of the Palestinian Arabs, in refusal to abide by the U.N. decisions on Palestine, in refusal to acknowledge the rights of those Arab refugees ruthlessly expelled from their country and ruined by the 1948 war. Developments over the past 20 years, since the proclamation of the State of Israel by decision of the United Nations, provide irrefutable proof that military victory cannot and must not cancel out the historical rights of the Arab people who ever since the early years of the century have valiantly fought for freedom, against the British mandate and colonial domination.

And throughout these years the Communist Party of Israel has upheld the incontestable principle that solution of the Palestine problem by recognizing the legitimate national rights of Jews and Arabs would be to the advantage of both peoples. True to its internationalist principles, it has urged the Israeli rulers to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs and, above all, of the Arab refugees. That has been the Party's guiding principle on the national question, which has been so thoroughly complicated by colonialism and imperialist attempts to instigate national strife in accordance with the old divide-and-rule formula.

CHARACTER AND SOURCES OF THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

In assessing any war, Lenin wrote, one must first consider its social implications and always be guided by the Marxist proposition that *"every war must be given a concrete appraisal."*

In unleashing the war against the Arab states, Israel's policy-makers were motivated not by considerations of their country's security, but by the understanding that the growth of the Arab liberation movement was jeopardizing vital imperialist interests. *Their whole policy was geared to the imperialist strategy of combating the Arab national-liberation movement. This enabled the imperialists to use Israel as a tool in their aggressive plans in the Middle East.*

The chief contradiction in this area is, as in the past, between the national-liberation movement and the progressive forces, on the one hand, and imperialism, on the other.

The record of the past 20 years will show that imperialism provoked Israeli aggression against the Arabs in order to impede the Arab struggle for freedom from imperialist oppression.

In discussing the June war, we must first point to its causes, and these have no relation whatever to Israel's genuine interests. From the very outset the war was directed solely against the gains of the Arab people.

The point and purpose of the Israeli alliance with imperialism can be seen in the fact that the Zionist movement is an imperialist instrument for spreading chauvinism and expansionist proclivities among the Israeli people.

Zionist spokesmen have provided an ideological basis for Israel's expansionist drive. Their claim to the whole of Palestine, they argue, stems from the Torah. Speaking 30 years ago before a British legislative commission on Palestine, Ben Gurion, one of the founding fathers of Israel, blandly stated: "The Torah will be the law of the State of Israel!"

And ever since that state came into being, Zionist ideology and aims have been political and military factors in imperialism's fight against the Arab national-liberation movement.

Zionist leaders make no secret of the fact that they interpreted the 1947 U.N. decision on the partition of Palestine as the prelude to an ambitious expansion program in the Middle East. And they launched out on that program immediately after the proclamation of the State of Israel: Palestinian territory was seized and about a million Arabs expelled from their homes.

Nor do the Zionists conceal that deployment of Israeli forces on the 1948 cease-fire line was the first step towards realization of the so-called Biblical Behest. Indeed, they maintain that last year's occupation of Shammron (the western bank of the Jordan) and Judea (Jerusalem area) were only part of the "Behest operation." Statements of this kind impel the Arabs to keep a vigilant watch on Israeli policy maneuvers.

Zionist preachment of enmity towards the Arab extends to Jewish communities in every part of the world, the purpose

being to tie the Jewish people to Israeli policy.

The point is discussed at length by Bert Ramelson, a leading member of the British Communist Party, in his booklet, *The Middle East Crisis*. "Zionism," he writes, "makes every Jewish community a hostage of Israel's foreign policy. The fate of such communities is no longer in their own hands or determined by conditions in the country where they were born and live, but becomes dependent on the state relations between Israel and the country of their domicile." Ramelson further speaks of the "unbridled Zionist-inspired anti-Soviet campaign," based on the mythical threat of "Soviet infiltration" in the Middle East.

Hostility towards the Soviet Union is clear and convincing evidence of the Zionist movement's ties with the aggressive imperialist plans against the forces of liberation, progress and socialism.

ISRAELI POLICY—A THREAT TO PEACE

The Israeli rulers contend that theirs' was a "preventive war." But now they refuse to withdraw from the occupied territories and are beginning to annex them, at any rate, part of them.

And though the Israeli rulers make no great secret of their expansionist propensities, many throughout the world, including progressive people, still ignore that fact of aggression and try to depict the continued occupation of Arab territory as a step towards peace.

The Israeli government has made the *Lebensraum* slogan a key element of its Middle East policy. In fact, it began to operate a *Lebensraum* policy in 1948 in relation to the property of the Palestinian Arabs. Today, too, many leading personalities in Tel-Aviv claim that territorial aggrandizement is essential to Israel's development.

Annexation of the Jordanian part of Jerusalem by decision of the Knesset on June 27, 1967, was meant to face the world with a *fait accompli*. Moshe Dayan said in a BBC broadcast: "Israel wants to retain the occupied part of Jordan . . . There is no law that the million Arabs in occupied territory must be part of Israel." He added that he favored "some form of autonomy."

Cabinet Ministers, Zionist leaders, and Court Communists, have signified, in one or another form, their support for the con-

tinued occupation and settlement of the Arab territories.

The war and subsequent developments have fanned chauvinistic and militaristic feelings not only among the Israeli rulers, but also among the public at large. Lust for conquest, powered by religious and historical legend, has gripped a large part of the people, notably the youth, and has largely vitiated the desire for peace. Foreign Minister Eban told the *Haaretz* newspaper: "There is no place in Israel for a peace mystique: there is only place for a territorial mystique that is assuming very realistic shape and form, and security mystique."

This conquest lust, which Eban euphemistically described as a "territorial mystique," is behind the so-called "indivisible Israel movement" organized for the express purpose of conditioning public opinion to unmitigated aggression.

The Israeli rulers persist in their policy of aggression, in total disregard of the country's interests and in total violation of all international standards. The extremists in Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem have done everything to torpedo the U.N. Jarring mission. They blame the Arabs, chiefly the United Arab Republic, for its failure, although everyone knows that the UAR has repeatedly expressed the hope that Jarring would help work out a peaceful political settlement.

ISRAEL DEPENDENT ON IMPERIALISM

The war increased Israel's dependence on U.S. imperialism. Complete subordination to the U.S. is the price the Israeli rulers have had to pay—they have pawned the country's future and the genuine interests of its people. The war exposed the role Israel is cast in by the U.S. imperialists, their allies and oil monopolies. Phillip Ben, New York correspondent of the *Maariv* newspaper, reported: "The United States is reaping the harvest of Israel's victory without having fired a single shot."

The war has had an adverse effect on living standards and on the economy in general. How great an effect can be judged from the new 1968-69 national budget.

Expenditure is set at I£6,000 million, 40 per cent up on 1965-66, though output has risen only 0.3 per cent. The budget is out of all proportion to the state of the economy and the government is compelled to rely on foreign hand-outs, thus increasing

its economic dependence on the imperialists. But, then, the budget is a reflection of the government's arms policy. Never before has Israel known such a steep rise in military spending, and moreover at the expense of cutting into wages, reducing appropriations for education and the social services.

Though the conscription period has been extended to three years, there has been no material drop in unemployment. According to official data, average wages in 1967 were 8.2 per cent below the 1966 level.

And again according to official data, recently published in the army journal *Bamachne*, maintenance of the army costs I£4 million a day, the security apparatus I£200,000 an hour. In the budget debate Communist deputy Tawfiq Toubi showed that expenditure on the Defense Ministry, special purposes and the general reserve (which likewise includes military appropriations), add up to I£2,245 million.

These figures reveal only one aspect of the crippling expenditure involved in the occupation of Arab territories and in the positions-of-strength policy vis-a-vis the Arab states.

In April, the Israeli government sponsored a conference of 400 international monopolists and financiers in an effort to enlist foreign capital investments. It offered tax exemption of profits, cheap labor, etc.

And it is not without the encouragement of the United States that the Israeli ruling element continues to block re-opening of the Suez Canal. This is regarded as a means of pressuring the United Arab Republic, but it also helps the big American shipping interests increase their profits. Continued closure of the Canal entails substantial economic losses for Egypt.

And Israel wants to keep things that way. That, presumably, is why it granted a Canadian holding company concession rights for a new 42-inch pipe-line extending from the Gulf of Aqaba to the Mediterranean port of Ashdot, as an alternate route for shipping oil from the Arabian south and Iran to the West. The project is estimated to cost \$200 million, but the actual cost will in all probability be twice that figure.

Another Communist deputy, Meier Vilner, opposed the project saying that politically and economically it was one of the most reckless operations in the whole of Israeli history. He added that only a government which shuns peace with the Arabs

and a policy of national economic independence could plunge into such an obvious gamble.

The purpose behind the gamble is clear enough: nullify the United Nations effort to secure peace in the Middle East and widen the gap between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

The author is convinced that this policy bodes no good for Israel. It continues the alliance with the Western oil magnates spearheaded against the Arab people and contrary to the vital interests of the Israeli people. (To this should be added that the existing pipe-line is capable of transporting up to 5.5 million tons of oil a year, twice the amount Israel itself requires.)

The Communist Party summed up the position in a statement issued on the 20th anniversary of the State of Israel: "Instead of developing economy and science for the good of the working people and the economic independence of our country, Israel's rulers turned this country into a domain and paradise for the foreign monopolies."

The Israeli economy is beset by serious difficulties, and this is having its impact on general conditions. Barring a miracle — or abandonment of aggression policies — nothing can save the country from economic upheavals and a full-dress crisis of the regime. For there is a mounting movement of protest against belt-tightening policies and economic militarization, which are re-fashioning the whole economic structure and increasing the political and economic dependence on U.S. and West German imperialism. But these are the very conditions conducive to a capitalist onslaught on the workers' rights and freedoms. Even the semi-official *Davar* found itself obliged to write: "A feeling of **disappointment** is in the air, an awareness that the war is not over and is being continued in other forms." The facts bear that out. Israeli policy has encouraged resistance in the occupied territories. The last 12 months have shown that the bloodshed can be stopped not by continuing the aggression, but only on the basis of the U.N. decision to withdraw the Israeli forces and of a peaceful and just solution of the Palestine problem.

The *Davar's* deputy editor, Mrs. Zemer, wrote a while ago: "Government spokesmen would have us (and the Arabs and the world) believe that we can maintain the status quo for at least another 20 years. The 10 months since the war have plainly shown that the status quo cannot be main-

tained and that change is vitally necessary."

The "national unity" regime is no longer the "monolithic" government, and it is now split into three groups. The first, the extremists, urge a "united Israel" by retaining all the occupied territories. The second group counsels a policy of direct negotiation envisaging frontier revision and the retention of Jerusalem. Its spokesmen are Foreign Minister Eban and the Mapam ministers, supported, with certain reservations, by Defense Minister Dayan, who wants to turn the Western bank of the Jordan into a zone closed to the Jordanian army and open to Israel. The third group, represented by Labor Minister Allon and backed by Prime Minister Eshkol, Ahdut Haavoda ministers and other officials not in the government, urges annexation of the Arab part of Jerusalem and Jewish settlements in the Jordan valley north of the Dead Sea.

However, none of these groups has a constructive solution. All of them work from expansionist aims. The press says the "national unity" government is unstable and may collapse, because it is planning highly dangerous measures.

Some in Israel believe that without an Israeli military presence on the East bank of the Jordan it will be impossible to assure Israel's security. The question is being studied by the government. Reports have appeared in the press of a statement by Premier Eshkol to the effect that should the Arab aggression (!) continue, "a situation might arise when Israel would have to defend the Western bank by taking possession of the Eastern bank" — in other words, seizure of more territory is by no means precluded. The Israeli leaders, refusing to accept the Security Council decision, are pursuing a policy that can only produce a deadlock.

That policy is fraught with very grave dangers for Israel's future. The people of the Arab and newly-liberated countries regard Israel as a weapon of imperialist aggression, and responsibility for that rests with the Israeli rulers. Their attempts to perpetuate the backwardness and subjugated state of the peoples of the Middle East run counter to the aim of freedom and progress these peoples have set themselves.

Israeli propaganda was able to mobilize a measure of support for this policy which, it claims, is the only one capable of assuring Israel's security. In fact, Israel has found supporters among the so-called Left, which is so fond of parading its socialist

slogans. And in Israel this Left includes pseudo-Communists, whom the Zionists hold up as paragons of patriotism. These people maintain that Israel's close ties with the U.S. are due to the Soviet Union's support of the Arab national-liberation movement, which they disparagingly label "Pan-Arabism." These "socialists" are doing their best to justify Israel's cooperation with the imperialists and urge continued occupation of the Arab territories.

Many still remember how Kautsky and Plekhanov justified their support for World War I — they used arguments borrowed from the bourgeois press, even referred to what Marx said in reference to 19th century wars. Repeating the bourgeois propaganda figment that the war was being fought in "self-defense," they misled the working people.

More, leaders of the Second International and of the Western Social-Democrat parties gave up whatever internationalism they had and became outright opportunists and social-chauvinists. Lenin remarked in November 1914: "It is sad, indeed, to see the growth of chauvinism in various countries and the treasonable acts of the German (and not only German) Marxists or would-be Marxists. . . ."

The latter-day would-be Marxists in Israel slander communism and the socialist countries. They have contributed in no small share to the confusion that now exists in the working class and have done everything to destroy the unity of Israel's progressive forces in order to make it all the easier for the reactionary and reckless faction to go ahead with the aggression. They are trying to devise a Marxist justification for the aggression in an attempt to get progressives throughout the world to support Israel's policy. One result of that policy is the growth of the extreme Right and adventurist elements in Israel, notably in the army and the government.

We Communists hold that he who supports and justifies continued occupation of Arab territory is doing a disservice to the cause of peace, the interests of the people and the unity of the revolutionary forces in the anti-imperialist struggle—he is only helping to foment more conflicts.

The Communist Party of Israel is no longer alone in combating the government's fatal policy. Fresh forces have come to the fore, boldly to campaign against colonial oppression in the occupied territories. They call for implementing the Security Council

resolution. A statement issued by a group of prominent Israeli personalities, writers, artists and scientists, calls for "peace without occupation." That statement is expressive of widespread sentiment, though this has not yet found organized expression. But the fact remains that the rift between reactionary policy and the interests of the people is steadily and rapidly widening. And this tends to deepen the political crisis and shake the very foundations of the "national unity" government, which includes representatives of all the Zionist parties and is supported by all the parliamentary groups with the sole exception of the Communists.

ESCALATION SYMPTOMS

That the war is not over was demonstrated in March when the Israel forces attacked the Karame refugee camp in Jordan. And significantly, the attack was launched shortly after Eshkol's visit to the United States.

The aim in attacking Jordan — on the pretext of suppressing commando activity — was to depose King Hussein and abolish the State of Jordan, since it is now obvious that Amman cannot fully follow a pro-imperialist policy. The changed attitude towards Jordan stems from the belief that its existence is a hindrance to annexation of the Western bank, which is a base for the continued struggle of the Palestinian Arabs.

Shlomo Avnery, a columnist who usually speaks for Moshe Dayan, commented in the *Haaretz* (March 25) that "Jordan's resistance is fully legitimate."

That being so, the attack on the refugee camp was merely a dodge to gain time, undermine Arab unity and resistance, and consolidate the gains of the war, that is, compel the Arabs to sign separate treaties on terms dictated by Israel.

The *Haaretz* London correspondent, Alef Shem, calls for a more active diplomatic and military policy. What he wants is spelled out in his words: "*Full support of the Western strategy against East European countries, initiative in unleashing another war, seizure of the east bank of the Jordan, overthrow of the United Arab Republic and dissolution of all political organizations supporting it, seizure of the area through which the Iraq petroleum and Aramco pipe-lines pass, seizure of part of Saudi Arabian territory on the Gulf of Aqaba, etc.*"

Knowing that they can rely on U.S. support, the Israeli rulers have flouted the Security Council resolution on withdrawal from Arab territory. Their policy is to turn the occupation into a *fait accompli*. Indeed, the Israeli government has brazenly announced that the boundaries of June 4, 1967 no longer exist and that there can be no return to the 1948 cease-fire line. The U.S., for its part, is exploiting the Israeli occupation to pressure Arab governments into compliance.

Some Zionist groups which still parade as Marxists justify the occupation by a "Marxist analysis" purporting to prove that last year's war was but a continuation of the 1948 war of liberation.

The Israeli Communist Party is convinced that the way to a peaceful settlement lies through an Israeli withdrawal and stringent implementation of the Security Council resolution. In our Party's opinion, the boundary question can be adjusted in context with the problem of the Palestinian Arabs, free use of international waters, etc.

The fact that there are powerful world forces behind the Security Council resolution should help towards a peaceful adjustment.

Even pro-Israeli forces abroad incline to the view that Israel must pull out of the occupied areas in order to assure its own survival.

The intransigence of the Israeli rulers and the continued occupation on the pretext of wanting "direct negotiations," plus organization of Jewish settlements in the occupied areas, are fraught with a new explosion, responsibility for which will lie squarely with the Israeli government.

In the situation that has arisen the Communist Party of Israel urges all peace supporters to join forces to pressure the government into abandoning its cooperation with imperialism in favor of cooperation with the U.N. mission. And such cooperation can be based only on complete withdrawal from the occupied areas. The shortest way to peace is peace itself — that should be the guiding principle if another catastrophe, the consequences of which no one can predict, is to be avoided.

PROSPECTS

The historical background to the present developments in the Middle East and throughout the world, the growing urge towards unity of the anti-imperialist, revolutionary forces and, above all, the world

Communist movement (as demonstrated by the Budapest Consultative Meeting), the U.S. debacle in Vietnam—all point to the inevitable defeat of the aggressors in the Middle East. For here, too, we witness the consolidation of the anti-imperialist forces battling for freedom and progress. This is becoming a weighty factor that will determine the outcome of the struggle.

We Communists believe that the bogus unity embodied in the “national unity” government, formed on the eve of the war and controlled by the military, runs counter to the genuine interests of Israel. Away back in 1956 we of the Communist Party vehemently opposed such illusionary unity, and we were later joined by wide sections of the people who saw through the fraud. We are waging our fight on the understanding that force cannot solve any of Israel’s problems. It can but complicate them and is, therefore, doomed to failure.

Our predictions have proved true: military success has not removed the tension or ruled out fresh military conflicts. Misled by their rulers about the aims of the war, which was presented as a war of defense, a war for peace, more and more people are coming to realize that the military extremists are plunging the country into the abyss.

More people are questioning the wisdom of government policy. One of our writers, Elisa Elwienberg, recently wrote in the newspaper *Lamerhav* that “the concept of ‘liberated territories’ is straight out of the fascist vocabulary. More, it is an attempt, probably not always conscious, to create a climate in which we do not have to ask ourselves whether or not we have the moral right to occupy these territories.” Much the same opinion is expressed by poet Amos Oz: “The whole question of Israel’s historic boundaries is fraudulent from beginning to end.”

Some people in Israel realize that the attitude to their country has changed markedly. Before the war Israel was regarded as a “persecuted” nation; now it is seen as a persecutor. Witness the point made by the journalist Amos Elon, in *Haaretz*: “The politicians in Jerusalem are having second thoughts and find themselves obliged to admit that our position is gradually and steadily deteriorating.”

The Israeli Communist Party, composed of Jews and Arabs, has rendered the country a great patriotic service by opposing the aggression, fighting for peace, combating Israel’s subjection to imperialism and

defending the independence and right to self-determination of all peoples.

In contrast to the official policy of strength and enmity towards the Arabs, our Party proposes a policy the efficacy of which has been confirmed by reality, one that would assure Israel security in a better future. In this we are supported by many people. Israel’s future lies not in the use of armed force, but in the search for understanding with the Arabs, in a joint anti-imperialist front and mutual recognition of the legitimate rights of both sides.

We believe that the Arabs and other peoples will win through in the anti-imperialist struggle because they have the powerful and sincere support of the socialist forces, led by the Soviet Union, and of the forces of peace and national-liberation everywhere.

But this will require consolidation of all the anti-imperialist forces in a concerted effort to work out a just solution to the problems of our region without any imperialist interference. Most Arab countries are prepared to cooperate with the Jarring Mission in operating the Security Council resolution as a first step towards a lasting settlement. The Arab attitude is meeting with growing support among the Israeli working class and the people generally. This is exerting a positive influence on the struggle against the government’s positions-of-strength policy and its instigation of armed conflict.

However, we do not shut our eyes to the government’s predilection for rash actions, and to prevent such actions will require persevering effort by all the peace forces to overcome the Israeli rulers’ opposition to the Security Council resolution. Its implementation would open new vistas to Israel and resolve the conflict by peaceful means.

The march of events has played havoc with all the schemes of the Israeli rulers. They are now face to face with new obstacles to their policy, which is inimical to peace and the real interests of the people. In contrast to the chauvinistic elements on both sides, which see no prospect of improving relations, we Communists take an optimistic view and feel sure that better relations are possible, and that the just cause of the peoples will triumph.

The Israeli rulers failed to impose their terms on the Arab states. Despite military defeat, last year’s war confirmed the viabil-

ity of the progressive national regimes in the United Arab Republic and Syria. It showed that the socialist world system, led by the Soviet Union, and all the forces of peace resolutely support the progressive Arab governments and are helping them suppress counter-revolution, imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Last year's Middle East aggression was a lesson to the entire national-liberation movement in its struggle against the imperialist plans to exploit local conflicts and

local wars to defeat the forces of progress without precipitating a world nuclear war. The aggression has heightened the vigilance and unity of the peoples in the fight against imperialism.

The lesson of the June war is that there must be more solidarity of all progressives in the Middle East, and primarily closer Communist solidarity, to secure a peaceful settlement of the conflict, safeguard the gains of the peoples and foil all imperialist designs.

Africa: economic integration problems

VACLAV OPLUSTIL

The emergence of dozens of independent states has virtually transformed the situation in Africa. The young sovereign nations are confronted with the formidable problem of eliminating economic and cultural backwardness, the result of imperialist domination and neo-colonial exploitation. And in this they can rely on the all-round support of the world revolutionary movement, including assistance in elaborating the problems involved in socio-economic development. Some of these, chiefly in relation to tropical Africa and the prospects of economic integration, are discussed in this article.

* * *

The rapid disintegration of the colonial system and the sweeping socio-political changes in the young African states over the past 10 years add to the difficulties of objective analysis. The Arusha Declaration, adopted by the Tanganyika African National Union in January 1967, was one of the first party political statements frankly to discuss some of the problems common to the young African states. It plainly showed that they were caught in a vicious circle.

Members of Parliament, cabinet minist-

ers, trade union and cooperative leaders have been requesting more money to finance development projects, public education, social services and medical care. But if the government were to provide the money, it would have to increase taxes. The Declaration explained the position by comparing the government to a milch cow. "We realize," the authors say, "that the cow has no more milk . . . We know that the cow would like to have more milk herself so that her calves could drink it . . . or it could be sold to provide more comforts for herself and her calves. But knowing all the things which could be done with more milk does not alter the fact that the cow has no more milk."

The emergence of independent states after World War II was followed by an upsurge in public life. Now, governments and public organizations have settled down to taking stock of material and manpower resources. They keenly feel their responsibility for the social, economic and cultural progress of what are now politically independent countries. Their economic starting point is vividly described in the economic survey for 1960-64 issued by the

U.N. Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) in 1967.

The 1964 gross domestic product (GDP), in 1960 market prices and inclusive of South Africa, amounted to \$40,750 billion. Per capita national income in 1963 was 1/27 of the North American and about 1/10 of the West European figure.

Per capita income figures vary widely: East Africa about \$82, West Africa \$92, Central Africa about \$95, and North Africa about \$172. The picture from country to country can be judged from the following data for the Joint African and Malagasy Organization on gross and per capita domestic product for 1965.*

	U.S. \$000,000	\$ per capita
Cameroon	670	130
Congo (Brazzaville)	138	150
Ivory Coast	963	250
Dahomey	165	70
Gabon	129	290
Upper Volta	257	53
Madagascar	578	90
Niger	250	75
Central African Republic	122	90
Senegal	680	195
Chad	237	70
Togo	156	95
Congo (Kinshasa)	1,273	80
Rwanda	155	50

Practically all African countries have short-term or long-term development plans. Most envisage doubling their national income: the United Arab Republic in 10 years (1960-70), Uganda and Tanzania 15 years, Upper Volta 17 years, Cameroon 20 years, and Chad 30 years.

There is also a wide margin of difference in another important indicator, per capita growth of GDP: Ethiopia—2.7 per cent increase (1963-67), Kenya—2.1 (1966-70), Uganda — 4.3 (1966-71), Tanzania — 4.6 (1964-69), Senegal—3.7 (1965-69), Togo—3.7 (1966-70), Ghana—2.9 (1964-70), Nigeria—1.5 (1962-68), Congo (Brazzaville)—5.1 (1964-68).

More important than these plan indicators are the statistics on *actual* per capita increase of gross and net domestic product: the GDP figure for the entire continent, including South Africa, rose from \$29.4 billion in 1955 to \$34.63 billion in 1960 and \$40.75 billion in 1964, which works out at an annual increase of 4.2 per cent in 1960-

1964. Per capita GDP grew at a much slower rate. Again taking the entire continent, including South Africa, it averaged 1.5 per cent a year in 1960-64, and only 1.1 per cent without South Africa. The respective figures for other areas (according to ECA) were: USSR and the European socialist countries 4.6 per cent, North America 2.5, Latin America 1.2, and Southeast Asia, including Japan, 4 per cent.

The picture is clear enough: economic advance in Africa has been much slower than in other parts of the world, with the result that the gap between it and economically developed countries has widened, not narrowed. Here, too, per capita increases of GDP are very uneven: North Africa 2.2 per cent, East Africa 0.7 per cent, Central Africa no rise, West Africa 1.3 per cent decline. West, Central and East Africa account for approximately two-thirds of the continent's population, and from this the ECA survey concludes that two Africans out of every three did not experience any improvement in income during the years of 1960-64.

Many different factors go into the socio-economic picture of Africa today. Some are attributable to Africa's unequal position in the international division of labor, which is dominated by the big capitalist monopolies. Another factor is one-crop agriculture, the result of continued economic domination by the imperialist powers. In this respect there has been very little change in most ex-colonial countries.

The adverse effect of imperialist domination and other external factors has been the subject of Marxist analysis. But not enough attention has been paid to internal retarding factors.

One of these is the exceedingly high birth rate. These are the figures for 1960-1965: the average population increase in capitalist countries amounted to approximately 1.2 per cent — 1.3 per cent in the U.S. and Canada, 1.1 per cent in the Common Market countries and 1.4 per cent in Japan. The figure for the Third World, according to some sources, was 2.4 per cent — 2.25 per cent in Africa, 2.7 in the Far East, 2.4 in the Middle East, and 2.95 in Latin America. According to the ECA, average population growth in Africa was 2.3 per cent in 1958-63, 2.5 in 1960-63 and 2.6 in 1965. Some U.N. experts predict that twenty years hence Africa will have the world's highest net birth rate.

Imperialist domination and its concomitant, economic backwardness, have left the

*Africa—1968, *Jeune Afrique*, Paris, 1968.

continent, despite vast national resources, with very meagre internal sources of accumulation. Per capita gross accumulation (without South Africa) in 1964 was only \$18, and only \$10 in East and Central Africa, but considerably higher in North Africa, \$33.5. The situation is much the same in East and South-east Asia, though the figure for Latin America is \$63, or 350 per cent of the African average. The picture is still more staggering when we compare Africa with Western Europe, where the figure is 15 times higher, or North America, where it is 37 times higher.

The statistics give cause for concern for Africa's future. They are evidence both of the complexity of its social problems and of the need for a complete reversal of present development trends. Without this, Africa will be doomed to social and political backwardness, and this is bound to have its repercussions in other regions. And so the towering problem before the continent, and before all progressive people, is how to assure steady progress that will eventually raise Africa to the level of the economically developed countries.

The problems are staggering, but they should not inspire a feeling of helplessness or pessimism. On the contrary, without an objective assessment of the present situation there can be no question of working out a theoretical concept of African development, and without such a scientifically elaborated concept there can be no question of purposeful, concerted effort to overcome age-old economic disabilities.

The fight for Africa is being waged in the class, political, foreign-policy, economic, national and ideological spheres. The fight is being conducted by the progressive forces and closely studied by Marxist scholars. However, without in any way belittling the work of both, it is necessary to draw attention to an essential aspect of the problem, namely, the need for a scientific understanding and theoretical analysis of the roots of the contradictory African reality.

Up till now many African ideologists and politicians have concentrated on formulating and popularizing certain basic principles, such as the social and cultural rights of Africans in relation to people of other races. However, even the African sun cannot make palm trees grow consumer goods, meat or dairy products. The social and cultural status of the African depends entirely on the material and technical basis of African society. The cardinal problem, therefore—and one that confronts every

independent African state—is how, by what means, a modern material and technical basis can be built.

African statesmen have put out a number of highly contradictory concepts of African society and, for that matter, human society generally.* Some of their authors have paid with their lives for the failure of their concepts, others have been imprisoned and still others driven into exile. Their failure does not necessarily prove that they were wholly wrong, but it is important to establish to what extent it was due to wrong ideas.

Kwame Nkrumah, an outstanding African intellectual in close touch with many of the complex aspects of African society, sought a way out of the continent's social and political stagnation. Judgments may differ on some of his political actions, both in relation to his own country and Africa as a whole, but the problems for which he sought solutions still remain unsolved. From the very outset, Dr. Nkrumah tried to bring the African masses into active political life, and above all to overcome the inertia of the peasant population. For this, he believed, was the only way to solve Africa's problems.

His opponents thought and acted otherwise. Instead of rousing the peasants from their inertia, they sought imperialist support and used social demagoguery to turn them against Nkrumah. For example, the peasant was told he would get twice as much for his cocoa crop if he voted for the anti-Nkrumah United Party. Nkrumah tried to get the peasant to understand his place in the community, to realize that cocoa was the chief source of revenue for industrialization. He tried to show the peasant that the problems of Ghana and every other African country represented an integrated complex. But he was not to bring his plans to fruition; his work was cut short by the military coup staged by reactionaries with the active support of the imperialists, who were alarmed by Nkrumah's progressive policies. And the success of this imperialist plot was due largely to the low level of political consciousness of the peasant mass.

Nkrumah and several other African politicians based their solutions of the continent's problems on the principles of Pan-Africanism. Prior to independence, Pan-African ideas, that is, African solidarity and viability in the battle against

*See the author's article, "Some Interpretations of Socialism in Tropical Africa," WMR No. 5, 1966.—Ed.

colonialism, helped to bring together the forces of the national-liberation revolution. After independence new problems arose requiring a new ideological platform, one that took into account de-colonization and the emergence of dozens of sovereign states, for whom political independence was, objectively, the most valuable gain of de-colonization.

Exponents of Pan-Africanism contributed in no small share to the struggle against the continent's Balkanization, that is, its division into a multitude of small, even midget, states that could not exist as independent economic entities. The failure of this struggle was largely due to the fragmentation of Africa's social structures. Indeed, even when the leadership tried to overcome this by political means, it had to yield to the pressure of centrifugal forces operating within each of the ethnic groups.

Besides, the low economic and social level at the time of independence militated against economic and political units embracing, say, the former federations of French West and French Equatorial Africa.* Houphouet-Boigny and other political leaders were opposed to these federations becoming independent units. The failure of the campaign against Balkanization cannot, of course, be attributed entirely to the attitude of some African leaders.

Nkrumah believed that despite the obvious failure of Pan-African plans to bring two, three or more territories into a single state, he could still convince the leaders of the newly-independent states to set up an all-Africa executive and legislative organ. He set out his plan at the inaugural conference of the Organization of African Unity at Addis Ababa in May 1963.

There is hardly any point in examining Nkrumah's arguments in favor of an all-Africa government and parliament and the objections raised by his opponents. But despite the popular desire for continental unity, even now, five years after the Addis Ababa conference, most African leaders remain markedly cool to these Pan-African projects. That is partly because it is extremely difficult to devise a method of coordinating from a single center the numerous, often contradictory, requirements and interests of dozens of states and national economies. Balkanization is a grave malady, the evil legacy of Africa's colonial

and pre-colonial past. And like every grave malady it will not vanish by the simple device of the patient rejecting objective diagnosis.

The round-table discussions of the early sixties on how to overcome Balkanization had their parallel in plans for economic integration patterned on the European Common Market. But in a number of African countries commodity production and market relations were still in the rudimentary stage and attempts were made to transplant forms of international economic cooperation suitable to relations between developed capitalist countries.

There was much propaganda for a common market embracing the entire continent. The Economic Commission for Africa pointed out that this required a much higher level of interdependence of participating countries. Economic integration on a continental scale could be regarded only as a long-range perspective and would have to be preceded by a variety of forms of cooperation between African nations. The ECA 1962 report on industrial development in Africa emphasized the advisability of cooperation within the framework of five main sub-regions.*

In recent years the ECA has concentrated on economic studies of the five sub-regions, treating each as a separate entity. That method, for all its limitations in economic and geographic terms, facilitates elaboration of Africa's long-range and immediate socio-economic problems.

The home market of most African countries is much too small to produce the necessary investment funds. Hence, the orientation on economic zones or regions offering optimal conditions for coordinated policies designed to overcome the backwardness. In fact African countries are obliged to employ every available form of economic cooperation in order to make the most efficient use of their restricted sources of capital formation. The problem

*North Africa: includes Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, the UAR, Sudan, Spanish North Africa and Ifni;

West Africa: includes Mauritania, Senegal, Mali, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Dahomey, Niger, Gambia, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ghana, Togo, Nigeria, Cape Verde, Portuguese Guinea and Spanish Sahara;

East Africa: includes Malawi, Zambia, Southern Rhodesia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Tanzania, Uganda, Kenya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Camoro Islands, Seychelles, Réunion and French Somaliland;

Central Africa: includes Cameroon, Chad, Central African Republic, Gabon, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Rwanda, Burundi, Sao Tomé and Príncipe, and Spanish Equatorial Africa;

Other Africa: includes Angola, Mozambique, the Republic of South Africa, South West Africa, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

*Consisting of 8 French colonies in West and 4 in Equatorial Africa.

of possible interconnections of the national economies should therefore receive priority from researchers.

However, even its purely theoretical solution presents many difficulties, and for the following reasons: with the liberation of the remaining colonial territories, Africa will have some 50 independent states, that is, 50 sovereign units, with differing levels of development.

Regardless of other factors, the problem becomes more complex the more units involved. For instance, with three countries cooperating, and with each contributing only one integration element, there are six logically possible alternatives or variants in allocating industry. If the system involves four states, the number of variants increases to 24, and in an integrated system of 10 states the number would be 3,628,800.

The purpose of this piece of arithmetic is to show that the more countries involved in integration, the greater the labyrinth of economic ties. Planning, coordinating and controlling them from one center borders on the utopian. In fact, even the sub-regions proposed by ECA are too big for efficient planning.

Apparently, if African economic development is to be regulated, there will have to be supra-national bodies to which each nation will concede some of its prerogatives. Even if these supra-national organs are to control only key branches of the economy, with due account for the broader interconnected requirements of Africa, they will have to provide for only a small number of states.

Objective requirements are already leading to the conclusion of numerous bilateral and trilateral agreements on mutually advantageous economic cooperation. For instance, Togo and Dahomey have agreed to set up a joint sugar industry and joint production of groundnut oil. Following the

organization of the Union of Central African States on April 2, 1968, the Central African Republic, Chad and the Congo (Kinshasa) started a joint air line, Air Afrique Central, and other joint undertakings.

Exploration of opportunities for economic cooperation within the sub-regions or even smaller units is attended by the study of prospects for cooperation on an all-Africa scale. And here the most realistic opportunities, in the opinion of many experts, are road construction, telecommunications, coordinated regulation of tropical crops (coffee, cocoa, citrus fruits, cotton, groundnuts), a uniform export price policy, etc.

The Organization for African Unity could play a big part in fostering economic cooperation. But that will require overcoming its present stagnation through constant and intensive effort to counter imperialist maneuvers to prevent closer African unity, and through a more realistic approach to continental cooperation.

* * *

Every step towards greater political independence shifts the center of the struggle between capitalism and socialism to the economic sphere. Such is the dialectics of African society. And from this point of view, the primary task today is to draw up and put into practice reproduction models adapted to African conditions. What is needed are models that would assure optimal rates of socio-economic development for each state and realistic forms of their cooperation.

The research conducted in this field by African Communists and Marxist scholars in the socialist and developed capitalist countries is a guarantee that Marxist science will make a valuable contribution to the comprehensive solution of the problems involved in Africa's social progress.

Latin America: two epochs and Marxism-Leninism

LONGINO BECERRA

When speaking about the national-liberation movement in Latin America, reference is frequently made to the struggle waged in the 19th century against Spanish colonialism. In many cases the allusions infer that the basic features of the liberation movement of those days fully apply to the present anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle of our peoples, that these features are even obligatory. To further the argument the names of the heroes of the struggle for independence — Bolivar, San Martin, and others — and their political concepts are cited.

In our view this approach is an oversimplified schema of the class struggle, for it applies one and the same strategic criterion to two different historical epochs — different in content and revolutionary development. We should like to express some views on this question, and particularly on the economic and political differentiation that set in on the continent after independence was won, and to show how anachronistic it would be to apply the concepts of Bolivar to the present struggle.

A ONE-COLORED MAP

Spanish America in the colonial period constituted a vast territory stretching from California in the north, to Tierra del Fuego in the south, a territory on which nations as we speak of them today did not exist. The sole form of administration were the vice-royalties, of which there were four: Nueva Espana (the present territory of Mexico and Central America), Nueva Granada which took in present-day Colombia, Venezuela, Panama and Ecuador, the vice-

royalty of Lima—which included Peru, the northern part of Chile and Argentina and in the southernmost part of the continent the vice-royalty of La Plata the borders of which extended over the territory now occupied by Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Bolivia.

The population of Spanish America at the beginning of the 19th century was approximately 20 million. The average annual output of the mining industry reckoned in terms of money was 64 million gold pesos. Trade with Spain brought in 80 million pesos and contraband trade with England and other countries—65 million gold pesos. The social structure at the time consisted chiefly of a feudal-landowning aristocracy (both Spanish and Creole), serfs and semi-serfs and slaves of African origin. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat already emerging in the sphere of trade and in some types of industry still occupied a secondary place in the class structure. The basic contradiction of those times was conflict between the colonial system (the Spanish army, the Church, foreign rule) and the local liberal forces — the latter steadily gaining ground as a result of internal developments and the influence exerted on them in different ways by the European bourgeoisie.

The economy was based on the feudal-slaveowning exploitation of the land and on mining, chiefly gold and silver. Although some industry had appeared here and there, it had not been developed due to the deformed state of the Spanish economy and the anti-dynamic consequences of Spain's colonial monopoly. The continent was therefore dependent on European imports

and on the handicrafts industry for its ready-made goods.

Consequently, when the contradictions of the entire system came to a head there was no advanced class capable of directing the liberation struggle and leading it to a social revolution that would effect fundamental changes in the continent's socio-economic structure. The leaders of the liberation movement—Bolívar, San Martín, Sucre, Santander, O'Higgins and others—came from that part of the Creole aristocracy influenced by the liberal views of the 18th century but lacking a clear concept regarding the social problems of the time. The ideas of such revolutionary thinkers as Narino, Vidaurre, Monteagudo, Moreno and Rivadavia could not exert a decisive influence on the struggle for national liberation. The slogans of struggle never went beyond appeals to fight the foreign oppressor. The people felt that they were the victims of the unconcealed plunder and this heightened their militancy even when they were not quite clear about what was happening. It is this that brought together in the liberation armies the oppressed and exploited and the Creole sections of the population although the latter were themselves the exploiters of Indians and Negroes.

The Creole aristocracy which arose basically from the exploitation of extensive latifundias and contraband trade, supported the liberation struggle as a means of putting an end to Spain's monopoly on the home and foreign markets. The collision between the local landowners, who were independent of the colonial monopoly, and the foreign oppressor was aggravated by the fact that the trend in agriculture to cultivate products in demand on the market encountered barriers erected by the colonial regime. Meanwhile the nascent commercial bourgeoisie — acting as middleman for European trade — made acquaintance with the European concepts of "free trade," and the ideas of liberation began to spread among the wealthy sections of the population. Hence, motivated by their immediate interests, this bourgeoisie displayed greater initiative than the exploited and plundered sections of the population. José Mariátegui, a Peruvian Marxist, wrote in this connection: "The contemporary researcher cannot fail to see in this the dominant historical factor of the South American liberation revolution. It was the interests of the Creole, and even of the

Spanish population, more so than of the Indian population that inspired the revolution and were its motive force."

When liberation came, the place of the Spanish rulers was taken, naturally, by the men of the Creole aristocracy. They took control of all economic levers, carried out some reforms, promoted free trade, but did nothing to change the feudal landlord character of the economy. Nor for that matter did they give effect even to the ideas so ardently championed by the Creole intelligentsia. Slavery, for example, was abolished in most of the countries only in the second half of the 19th century.

THE OLD MOLE OF HISTORY CHANGES THE STATE OF AFFAIRS

In the 150 years since then things have changed. Entirely new economic and political factors have appeared. When the multi-national projects of Miranda, Bolívar and other patriots were buried under the onslaught of the reactionary forces, national states arose expressing the interests and aspirations that had been voiced under the colonial regime. In the course of time these elementary interests evolved to a degree where they became the essence of nationalism with all the multiform features acquired by the respective peoples in the course of their history. Symbolical of this nationalism are the national flags, emblems and anthems which, politically, play a role similar to geographical frontiers. The concept *sovereignty*, non-existent in the pre-republican period, embodies the vitally important individuality achieved by our peoples in the past 150 years of their development. It awakened a sense of patriotism, the direct factor spurring them to militant action.

The new economic forces which gave added impetus to the independence struggle, developed apace once the obstacles of a superstructure nature were removed. Competition by new countries on the international market stimulated growth of agriculture and industry. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat who, as noted earlier, had appeared already in the colonial period began to play an increasingly bigger role in the 19th century, becoming in the second half an effective force in the new anti-feudal transformations.

However, this process did not proceed unhampered. British capital began to penetrate into the economy of the Latin American republics around about the time of

their liberation struggle against Spain; later this capital monopolized a large part of the continent's foreign trade and railways. Had this process continued to develop, subordinate only to the economic laws governing the development of each of the countries, the abolition of the old production relations would, indisputably, have proceeded in the usual way, and typically capitalist economic structures would have appeared. But this did not take place. Matters were exacerbated towards the end of the 19th century when U.S. capital began to find its way into this area. In search of super profits, cheap raw materials and labor power, the North American monopolies slowed down the normal process of the dying out of pre-capitalist production relations on the continent. The U.S. penetration continued apace in the present century, edging out British capital. The underdeveloped, backward economy of our countries today is the result of this U.S. penetration.

The present U.S. monopoly investments are an alien body in the economic structure of the Latin American states. The developed production relations which these investments originally engendered, have not blended with the economy of the respective countries and remain separate "islets" in the overall economic picture where low productivity is the rule. Such are the ugly consequences of imperialist policy aimed at extracting big profits from these investments. According to U.S. sources, profits from direct investments on our continent in 1964 totalled \$1,095 million. Of this sum a bare \$298 million were reinvested in our countries in 1965. Hence, it is not a question of investments to "promote the development" of the countries where these are made (as U.S. propaganda would have us believe), but, as is all too obvious, of imperialist tentacles stretching to our continent to drain it of its natural wealth. Because the normal process of economic development was slowed down the present productive structures of the Latin American economies contain survivals of the pre-capitalist formations, dependent national capitalism and foreign capitalism. The U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America uses the term "underdeveloped" for this situation, thereby stressing the backwardness of the Latin American continent compared with other countries of the world. But it says nothing about the role of the external, determinative factor. For it is not just a matter of an underdeveloped econ-

omy, but of a deformed economy.

As regards the basic contradiction, there is a vast difference between the two epochs. The productive forces of today are doubly tied by production relations: on the one hand — by the survivals of pre-capitalist times and, on the other, by parasitic capitalism supported in our countries by the big U.S. monopolies. Whereas in Bolivar's day the main contradiction was between the colonial structure and the new, developing economic relations, today this contradiction is determined by internal and external factors. Hence the trend to unfetter the productive forces is expressed in two ways — that of fundamental structural changes and anti-imperialist struggle.

Thus, a critical examination of the two factors hampering the free development of the productive forces shows that it is imperative to do away with the pre-capitalist survivals, and just as imperative to fight the force supporting the anachronistic relations of production, namely, U.S. imperialism.

THE SPECIFIC DIFFERENCES

The basic contradiction in the Latin American economy manifests itself in different ways and degrees, depending on the specific features that have crystallized in each country in the past 150 years. This is yet another basic element that sets apart (in form and in content), the times of Bolivar, of the anti-colonial struggle from the present period of the anti-imperialist struggle. During Bolivar's lifetime the basic contradiction manifested itself in more general forms than at present: at one end was a colonial power, at the other — the entire continent with insignificant politico-economic differences between the different regions. It was no accident that the decisive resistance to Spanish rule started almost simultaneously in the principal centers of the continent: in Caracas in April 1810, in Buenos Aires in May, in Bogota in June, and in Mexico in September of the same year.

Today the situation is more complex. The basic contradiction in the continent's social structure manifests itself differently and to a different degree in particular countries, due largely to uneven development. Economic and political factors, therefore, do not have the same bearing in the Latin American structure, and their role in the general picture of contradictions is likewise not the same. Whereas in the past

the factors of revolutionary change were able to mature on a continent that was a colonial entity, today this depends, first, on the politico-economic processes in the national states and, second, on the emergencies encountered by the imperialist system as the world balance of forces changes to its disadvantage.

An analysis of the political and economic factors operating in the Latin American countries reveals differences which cannot but lay their imprint on the struggle between the two opposing antagonistic forces on the continent — the people and U.S. imperialism. For example, natural economy is more extensive in some countries than in others, and in some it does not exist at all. This is borne out by various facts, and none more striking than those relating to the continent's indigenous population and the social forms of their organization. The following data of the Pan-American alliance is indicative: in Bolivia, Indians make up 70.77 per cent of the population, in Ecuador—40.39 per cent, in Guatemala—41.68 per cent, in Peru—33.65 per cent, in British Honduras—22.55 per cent. These figures contrast sharply with those for such countries as Argentina where Indians account for only 0.6 per cent of the population, Costa Rica—0.6 per cent and Brazil—1.79 per cent. The way of life of the Indians has hardly changed since the times of the Spanish conquistadors. Numerous Indian communities still exist in most of the Latin American republics. Statistics show, for example, that there were 1,343 such communities in Peru in 1951, including 651 of the pre-Spanish type. It is clear that this factor (it being a question of large numbers of people still living and working in conditions characteristic of the primitive communal system), poses problems that do not figure in general, or are posed in a new way in those countries where this type of social structure no longer exists. This fact becomes doubly evident if we bear in mind that the struggle for genuine independence has two aspects—anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic.

Feudal-type relations of production also differ from country to country. Capital accumulation in agriculture proceeded, and is continuing to proceed, at different rates, and productivity in this sphere is, consequently, not the same in all the countries. Investments in agriculture in most Latin-American republics (represented by the latifundias and small farms) are inconsid-

erable compared with those in other countries. This, naturally, affects productivity which, in turn, depends on machinery and fertilizers.

To cite the number of tractors used per 10,000 hectares of cultivated land: Haiti—1, Ecuador, Honduras and Paraguay—3, Panama, Dominican Republic and El Salvador—9, Argentina—10, Venezuela and Brazil—15, Bolivia—21, Peru—24, Mexico—25, Colombia—26, Chile—36, Uruguay—76. Compare these figures with the United States where there are approximately 222 tractors for every 10,000 hectares of arable!

The proportion of industry also varies from country to country, as may be seen from the structure of the gross national product given in percentages and a comparison of the 1964-1965 figures for industry and agriculture: in seven countries (Venezuela, Chile, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, Puerto Rico and Mexico), industry accounted for 27.5 per cent of the gross national product, agriculture—12.0 per cent. Mexico showed the highest indicator—34.2 per cent, Chile the lowest—19.7 per cent. Venezuela is a special case: the share of its manufacturing industry was 17.1 per cent and extraction industry (oil), 29.0 per cent. Agriculture accounted for only 7.0 per cent of the gross national product. In the rest of the continent agriculture accounted for most of the gross national product—33.5 per cent, industry for only 19.4 per cent. Haiti and Honduras showed the highest indicators of the dependence on agriculture—49.1 per cent respectively.

Industrial concentration in some of the countries is quite considerable, a fact of particular importance for the development of the working-class struggle. Argentina is indicative in this respect. According to 1954 figures it had in all 151,798 industrial enterprises 2,963 of which employed from 50 to more than 1,000 workers. Although these constitute a mere 1.92 per cent of the total number of industrial units, they accounted for 58.6 per cent of the national product. That this economic differentiation is having its effect on the class struggle is indisputable.

The differentiation in the base makes for a corresponding differentiation in the superstructure, for, as Marx pointed out, the mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general. As we see, the Latin American states did not develop in the same way after their formation in 1810-

1826. Although they adopted the form of a bourgeois-democratic republic the system of government accords with the specific conditions that have evolved in each country, irrespective of whether or not this dovetails with the liberal ideas of the 18th century. In Chile, Uruguay, Costa Rica and Mexico political development brought with it consolidation of the bourgeois-democratic institutions and the establishment of certain legal forms. Of course, these institutions are able to exist because of the struggle waged by the progressive groups of the population and not because of the spontaneous operation of the principles of liberal philosophy. However, even this pseudo-freedom and pseudo-democracy are unknown to other countries of the continent. In Paraguay, Haiti, Honduras, Guatemala and Nicaragua, for example, where the members of the ruling oligarchies mostly come from the parasitic class of latifundists, and where the socio-economic structure is still influenced by traditional conservatism, these legal forms are absent, the authorities preferring to use direct means of coercion. Needless to say, this difference in the political set-up cannot but affect the process of the class struggle, accelerating or retarding it. This is evident also from the different political slogans advanced by the Latin American democratic movement. In the more backward countries where tyrannical and dictatorial regimes have been installed, political demands are advanced which elsewhere are now a matter of history. One such slogan is the demand for legal or even semi-legal status for the Left forces.

A RAPIDLY DEVELOPING PROCESS

It follows from the aforesaid that the liberation of Latin America should be seen not as a single continental problem but as a many-sided process, developing in accordance with the maturing of the class struggle in the particular country.

The continental revolution should be seen as a dialectical synthesis of national revolutions and not as a uniform phenomenon, subordinate to laws of simultaneous origin. The features that have evolved in our countries during the past 150 years of their history constitute also the material base for the maturing, not necessarily simultaneously, of favorable conditions for revolution. This means that at different times and through concrete forms as yet difficult to foresee, one or another country will be

able to change its structure radically and advance to a new stage of continental unity—a unity that will spring from the general nature of the internal revolutionary processes. However, this process cannot be accelerated artificially. The different parts constituting this continental entity will take shape in accordance with their own development.

The differences in the Latin American countries, determining the stage-by-stage development of the revolutionary process on the continent, should not be taken as the premise for a nationalist approach to the struggle against the main support of the reactionaries on the continent—U.S. imperialism. Account must be taken of the economic and political differences since they determine the features of the struggle between the old and the new in Latin America. However, these differences do not cover the entire picture. If this is seen as the starting point in the sense that the process of national liberation depends on the aggravation of contradictions in each country with their external and internal components, there is also the end point that should not be lost sight of: essentially the Latin American revolutions coincide since they are anti-imperialist revolutions. This factor unites them dialectically. It is in this sense, and in this sense only, that we speak of the developing continental revolution. We, therefore, think that to approach the problem of Latin America's liberation the way Bolívar did, would be an historical anachronism. But we also think that it would be anti-dialectical to reduce the struggle to isolated actions and the isolated development of its components.

The revolution that began on our continent with the victory of the Cuban people is a revolution whose character can be defined exactly; it is a process aimed at breaking the Gordian knot of the socio-economic structures of our countries, at clearing the way for the development of the productive forces fettered by the feudal-imperialist system; it is the continuation of the historical process of change that began in the world with the victory of the Bolsheviks in 1917. However, to achieve maximum results, this process has to pass through certain stages according to the following Leninist principle: “. . . the struggle for political liberty and a democratic republic in a bourgeois society is only one of the necessary stages in the struggle for the social revolution which will

overthrow the bourgeois system." (*Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Vol. 8, p. 24.)

And so, in the present conditions of Latin America the only class that can head and consistently carry through this process of social reconstruction is the working class, in alliance with the progressive sections of the population. In their actions the workers are inspired by the spirit of internationalism; this principle unites the Latin American revolutions and links them with the world revolutionary movement, all the more so that both have to contend with a common enemy. A nationalist approach to the basic problems of Latin America would negate one of the fundamental principles of the contemporary world revolution and strengthen the reactionary forces, since it makes for isolationism and absurd quarrels. "Capital," Lenin wrote, "is an international force. To vanquish it an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood is needed.

"We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists." (*Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 293).

From what has been said it follows that dialectical unity of the Latin American revolutions is the first aim, the ultimate one being completely to merge these revolutions. Already in the liberation movement **proletarian** internationalism acts as a force that integrates the various national movements and, without violating their frontiers, promotes unity of action against the enemy. Proletarian internationalism is a clear-cut concept, having only one possible meaning. Lenin formulated it as follows, and in our view this formulation holds true in our day as well: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) *this struggle*, *this and only this*, line, in every country without exception." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75.) The conclusion to be drawn is quite obvious: it is essential to tackle the basic tasks advanced by the revolution in every country (irrespective of its stage of development) and then, having performed our direct duty, support by every means the revolutionary movements in other countries, duly taking into account the stage of their internal development. In accordance with this principle it would be incorrect to carry out any major internationalist actions while

our basic revolutionary duty at home has not been accomplished, for this may prejudice the struggle in the respective country and the revolutionary cause as a whole. Such actions would likewise run counter to the set goal if the subjective wish to advance the revolutionary process transcends the existing bounds of the class struggle in the country concerned.

WE ARE LIVING IN THE AGE OF THE RAPID GROWTH OF MUTUAL INFLUENCE

The differentiation between the Latin American countries did not proceed in conditions of isolation. Factors characteristic of the respective nations, and also elements engendered by the mutual influence exerted by them and by the rest of the world, helped to shape the socio-economic set-up in each of the Latin American countries. As the social process intensifies this mutual influence becomes increasingly apparent in all spheres. Rising labor productivity, the outcome of science and technology, necessitates a still greater exchange between the nations if the numerous problems that come with development are to be solved. This, and the exchange of ideas, discoveries, etc., are facilitated by modern transport and communications, and every nation can therefore today give and receive much greater values than in the past. Assimilation of these external factors with the internal determines the image of each country. Hence, isolation has no place in the contemporary world. To regard national differences as something engendered only by internal factors would be tantamount to writing off this component which is becoming increasingly more weighty as a result of accelerated development. Equally, to overestimate the external factors promoting national development would be a departure from reality.

It should be noted at the same time that the Latin American republics do not differ totally from each other. As a result of reciprocal exchange, certain social and cultural forms spread beyond the confines of their provenance, especially when they emanate from those republics that carry greater weight on the continent. Besides, the similarity of certain features derives from the fact that some of the countries share geographical zones with definite conditions. A case in point are the five small countries situated on the Central American isthmus which, although they do

not have a common socio-economic make-up, nevertheless reveal common features in their social structure. However, these more or less common features can in no circumstances serve, in our view, as a basis for continental or regional generalizations regarding the maturing of the revolutionary process. This process, as we have said, depends on the internal development of the class struggle in each country, although due account should be taken of stimulative effects of external factors.

MARXISM-LENINISM—AN ETERNALLY LIVING DOCTRINE

Marxism-Leninism is an effective instrument for analyzing the revolutionary struggle in Latin America. The rapid development of the struggle, resulting from the conditions of the day and from the Cuban revolution, makes it incumbent on Latin American Marxists to find the answers to the questions posed by the anti-imperialist movement in our countries. And we should, I think, work on the premise that we are in the midst of a new and highly specific phase in the continent's economic and political development. This poses problems, and the problems have to be solved. But this does not mean that we should negate the past, especially when we consider the glorious tradition of the fight against Spanish colonialism. The crux of the matter, I think, is to regard the past not as a fount of wisdom from which we can extract all the answers (regarding the continental revolution, simultaneous armed struggle, etc.), but rather as a stimulus to creative analysis based on the realities of our time. Marxism-Leninism, the scientific doctrine of the proletarian revolution, is of the utmost value in solving our problems.

Marxism has not lost its validity, and never will. For Marxism is not a system of dogmas formulated for all time; it is a system of dialectical principles reflecting the development of nature and society. The task of the Marxist is to apply its basic principles to an analysis of the changing reality to disclose the sources of change and help to orient it in the direction required by society.

An outstanding example of that was given us by Lenin, who lived and worked in the imperialist phase of capitalism. With consummate skill, Lenin applied the Marxist method of scientific analysis in directing the revolutionary struggle of the Russian and world proletariat. Lenin never main-

tained that the earlier Marxism had become flabby or obsolescent, nor did he ever contend that by his own contribution he had created a new doctrine.

Engels wrote that we must always clearly bear in mind that "socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, that is, that it be studied." In this, too, Lenin gave us a shining example, one that stands out in sharp contrast to those who would reduce Marxism to some kind of political mystique, or an amalgam of views.

As the synthesis of revolutionary thought, Marxism-Leninism which took final shape in two different periods, does not belong among the doctrines which one day will be consigned to the dustbin of history. For its very substance is dialectics, and they can become obsolete—as some maintain they will—only in the event of the laws of the universe undergoing radical change.

In Latin America one often hears it said that Marxism-Leninism, or at any rate some of its fundamental principles, are out of date. The founders of scientific socialism, we are told, did not live in our times and, besides, they had little or no knowledge of Latin America.

Accordingly, there have been attempts to "renew" scientific socialism, or to "adapt" it to the specific conditions of Latin America by advancing concepts wholly alien to the very substance of Marxism-Leninism. One such concept is neo-Bolivarism, with its continentalist theses regarding the revolutionary process in our day. Marxism-Leninism is a constantly developing science and nothing is so alien, indeed contradictory, to it as dogmatic repetition of propositions formulated in the context of one or another concrete phenomenon. But it should be equally clear that any attempt to renew scientific socialism by renouncing its central principles (the leading role of the working class, the need for Communist parties, understanding of revolutionary situations, etc.), is a denial of Marxism, not its creative development.

Marxism-Leninism is the guiding theory of the Latin American revolution. Correct application of its fundamental principles to the specific realities of our various countries is the guarantee of the continent's revolutionary development. The substitution of tried and tested scientific propositions by unscientific can only lead to defeat.

in the conflict with the reactionary forces in each of our countries. Latin America is not in need of a new revolutionary theory. What is needed is creative application of Marxism-Leninism, the only viable revolutionary theory. And our Communist parties are making, and doubtlessly will continue to make, vigorous efforts towards that end. They have proved productive of result, for today we have clear answers to many of the questions posed by the revolutionary struggle in Latin American countries. On

the other hand, many general and concrete problems of the Latin American revolution await proper analysis, and this is a constant challenge to our Marxists. However, the fact that there are such problems is no justification for denying the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism, or for the Communist parties to relinquish their vanguard role in conditions of harsh political restrictions. There must be positive and creative endeavor. That is the most valuable contribution we can make.

Stop the terror against political prisoners in Iraq

Nukrat as-Salman, Ramadi, Hilla, Baquba, Baghdad—these are only some of the many prisons and detention camps that are filled with political prisoners, with hundreds of the country's fighters for freedom and democracy: Communists and non-Communists. Among the prisoners are workers and peasants, students and intellectuals, patriotic military men, Arabs and Kurds and people of other nationalities.

Despite the numerous national and international campaigns calling for a general amnesty, despite the repeated promises made by successive governments of the reactionary military regime, hundreds are still languishing in prison under the most appalling conditions.

The authorities have recently intensified their persecution of patriotic forces. On April 11 an armed group of Military Intelligence arrested the progressive Thabit Habib, well-known as a fighter against the old monarchist regime. Habib led the student demonstrations against the Baghdad Pact in 1956, played a leading role in the struggle of the Iraqi people following the July 1958 revolution. After his arrest Habib was taken to Military Intelligence headquarters where he was savagely tortured. His fate remains unknown.

This is not the first time that the reactionary military regime has arrested progressives and patriots. Some months ago the trade union leader Ara Khachadur was arrested in similar circumstances.

The authorities not only sanction the arrests but also encourage the use of torture during interrogation. Prisoners are

subjected to all kinds of pressure to force them to sign a declaration "renouncing" their convictions.

In the notorious Nukrat as-Salman prison, situated in the southern desert of Iraq, hundreds of kilometres from any inhabited area, many prisoners have died because of brutal treatment. The organs of the dictatorial regime are silent about the many petitions sent by the prisoners to the prison authorities requesting that they change the brutal conditions in the prison, afford medical treatment to the sick and allow visits by relatives and friends.

In the Ramadi prison the administration engineered a number of provocations against the political prisoners as a result of which four were wounded, seven transferred to Nukrat as-Salman where some of them were kept in solitary confinement.

Although many prisoners have served their terms, they are still kept behind bars as hostages. Many were killed during the fascist terror that followed the counter-revolution in February 1963.

All progressive and patriotic forces in the country are demanding that the terror against the political prisoners be stopped, that they be released.

The life of these patriots is in danger. It is the duty of all progressive and democratic political parties and public organizations, of all who cherish freedom, national independence, democracy and social progress to voice their protest and insist that the Iraqi authorities stop the terror against the political prisoners and free them.

S.A.

Call to vigilance

party, the National-Democrat Party (NDP), is out to whitewash Hitlerism, distort history and inculcate jingoism and racialism. It wants nuclear weapons for the Bundeswehr, revision of European boundaries, liquidation of the German Democratic Republic, seizure of Austria, severance of large areas from Poland, Czechoslovakia, the USSR and Italy.

That is its revenge program. But, West German writer Kurt Hirsch says in his book, *Will the Nazis Return?*,* "The NDP oratorical tone has in some cases changed compared with Hitler's propaganda. However, despite this tactical dodge and repeated professions of loyalty to West German law, speeches and articles by NDP leaders show that they are the spiritual successors to Hitler's National-Socialist Party. True, the NDP has been careful to adapt itself to the times—business suits have replaced the nazi uniform. But the mentality, conceptually criminal, has not changed."

Hirsch's book is certainly topical. The recent Baden-Wuerttemberg elections gave the neo-nazis 12 seats in the state legislature, bringing their total to 57 in seven states; their total vote now stands at 1,500,000, and the NDP boasts of obtaining at least 50 seats in the next Bundestag. That these figures should cause concern in Germany and throughout the world is only natural.

The men responsible for West German policy pretend that mounting neo-nazi strength offers no danger to the Federal Republic. Hirsch shows that this is not so: "Dangerous attempts to belittle the importance of NDP electoral successes are reminiscent of events during the Weimar Republic. In 1928-31, more effort was put into minimizing the implications of nazi successes than in combating the spread of nazism."

Neo-nazi activity in West Germany is growing from day to day. The new Nazi

What is behind this growth of the extreme Right? What social and political forces support the NDP? What are the inspirations of its policy? Hirsch gives the answer, closely documented, skilfully argued and backed by a formidable array of statistics.

Most of the party's candidates and electors come from the middle classes, small businessmen, coupon-clippers and the like. But there is a liberal sprinkling of ex-nazis and revenge-seeking elements. And Hirsch emphasizes that "for years the radical Right has been successfully recruiting members and gaining voter support precisely among these elements. Menaced by the technological revolution, they look for protection to those parties and organizations which demagogically promise to help them."

The fact is that the class basis of Hitler fascism is still there. Hirsch quotes von Thadden, the NDP leader: "We have many friends in the Ruhr." And it will be recalled that the Ruhr magnates had put Hitler in power. Hirsch reminds his readers that prior to 1933, employer associations and their paid propagandists "gave financial and propaganda support to the sworn enemies of the Republic and helped the Nazis against their opponents." That "fatal tradition" is being continued.

"What we have," Hirsch says, "is an alliance of economic, political and propaganda power—a much closer alliance than is permissible in a democratic state and tolerable by its citizens. United to fight the 'abettors of the Soviets' are extreme Right newspapers, 'fraternity' publications and the Springer press, whose hate sheet, *Bild*, goes into millions of West German homes."

There is also the fact, strongly emphasized by Hirsch, that the neo-nazis enjoy "most-favored treatment." In his view, the danger of the recent NDP electoral victories lies not so much in the existence of this extremist party, as in the absence of any

*Kurt Hirsch. *Kommen die Nazis wieder? Gefahren fuer die Bundesrepublik*. Verlag Kurt Desch, Muenchen, 1967, 200 S.

clear line of division between NDP ideology and that of the Bundestag parties.

NDP success at the polls is no chance accident. West Germany is harvesting the seeds sown by its rulers over the past two decades. Bonn, the press says, is responsible for the present state of affairs. For it is the Bonn rulers who throughout these

postwar years have been instilling in the public mind the political goals which are now being openly advocated by the NDP.

Hirsch's book is a warning to the politically blind, to those who do not want to see the danger of nazism and militarism in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Rostislav SOKOLOV

Brief notices

JEAN FREVILLE. *Lenine a Paris*. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1968. 247 pp.

JEAN FREVILLE. *Lenin in Paris*. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1968. 247 pp.

As the international revolutionary movement becomes more widespread and the ideas of socialism take deeper root among the people, there is an increasing demand to know more about the life and work of Lenin, the architect of the first victorious socialist revolution in the world.

In his book *Lenin in Paris*, Freville partly meets this demand. Drawing a panoramic picture of Lenin's manifold theoretical and political activity, he describes Lenin's sojourn in the French capital in 1908-1912, his close ties with the French working class, his struggle against the opportunists in the Second International, and shows Lenin and his associates, in the complex situation of inner-party struggle preparing for the ultimate victory of socialism.

The author notes that the Leninist tradition of internationalism, of unity of revolutionaries of all lands, unity based on scientific socialism, enriched by international experience, is particularly important in our day. Lenin showed the indissoluble link between the heritage of the Paris Commune and the revolutionary struggle of his time, that international unity is the guarantee of working class success. Freville underscores that the experience of Lenin, the example of Lenin have not lost their viability, and are as valid as ever before.

S. T.

JOHN GOLLAN. *Crisis*. London, 1968. 22 pp.

In his small, but well-grounded booklet, John Gollan, General Secretary of the Com-

munist Party of Great Britain, examines the activity of the Wilson government, which has resulted in a profound crisis in the labor movement and in the government itself. He discloses the reasons for the crisis: the Labor Right-wing's unflinching defense of the foundations of capitalism, loyal capitalist administration in the interests of the monopolies, the policy of putting the burden of the crisis of British imperialism onto the shoulders of the working class.

Only a complete break with this policy can help the country emerge from the present crisis, Gollan stresses.

United action by Communists and Lefts, and a new socialist policy would, the author notes, counter the reformist tendencies that have invariably brought about the downfall of the Labor governments, would promote international working-class action against world capitalism, strengthen the cooperation of the working-class movement of Great Britain with the progressive movements in other countries. But, he adds, for the Left forces and the movement towards socialism to be successful, a much stronger Communist Party is needed.

A.D.

Ekonomicheskaya teoriya Marxa-Lenina i Sovremenni Kapitalizm.

Moskva, Mysl, 1967. 405 pp.

The Economic Theory of Marx and Lenin and Modern Capitalism.

Moscow, Mysl, 1967. 405 pp.

In this book a group of Soviet authors examine the postwar development of world capitalism from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint, supplementing their study with the evidence of Western Marxist economists.

Showing up the fallacy of bourgeois political concepts, the authors arrive at the conclusion that although the old economic phenomena are modified and new ones appear as state-monopoly capitalism develops, and that no matter how significant many of these may be, the fundamental laws of capitalism, discovered by Marx and Lenin, remain unchanged. In fact, the antagonistic contradictions of this system become still more profound.

Describing the essence of state-monopoly capitalism, the authors show that it is a complex and contradictory process, a pro-

cess in which the monopolies are fusing with the state, a process of both reactionary and progressive trends.

To preserve capitalism the bourgeoisie is compelled to make a series of concessions to the people. But these cannot cancel the operation of the general law of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx.

The book treats at length of capitalist profit, ground rent, economic cycles and crises under present-day capitalism, state-monopoly integration, the disintegration of the colonial system, etc.

B. L.

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Sychineniya* (Works), Vol. XXIII. Sofia, BKP, 1968. 900 pp.

MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Werke* (Works), Vol. 38. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 752 pp.

ENGELS, F. *Textes choisis par Kanapa* (Selected Works, compiled by Kanapa.) Paris, Editions sociales, 1968. 523 pp.

CSIKOS-NAGY, B. *Altalanos es szocialista arelmelet*, (The Universal and the Socialist Theory of Prices.) Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1968. 428 pp.

CSIZMADIA, E., DANKOVITS, L., UDVARI, L. *A magyar mezogazdasag* (Hungarian Agriculture.) Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1968. 292 pp.

DZIEDZIC, J., WALICHNOWSKI, T. *Wokol agresji Izraela* (The Israeli Aggression.) Warsaw, KiW, 1968. 173 pp.

GRIECO, R. *Scritti scelti* (Selected Works.) Preface by Giorgio Amendola. Vol. I, edited by Enzo Modica, 680 pp. (1914-39: Formation of the ICP, Its Political Struggle Between the Two Wars); Vol. II, edited by Gerardo Chiaromonte, 608 pp. (Works on regional administration, the agrarian question, the problems of the South. Articles of the cold war period.) Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1968.

Mit der Sowjetunion. Sieger der Geschichte (With the Soviet Union. The Victors of History.) Social Sciences Institute of the CC, SUPG. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 278 pp.

Moral und Gesellschaft (Morality and Society.) Edited by Bernd Bittighoefer and Juergen Schmollack. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 359 pp.

Ocherki istorii ideinoi borby vokrug "Kapitala" K. Marksa (1867-1967). (Sketches of the Ideological Struggle Over Marx's Capital.) Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 295 pp.

PAJESTKA, J., SECOMSKI, K. *Doskonale nie planowania i funkcjonowania gospodarki w Polsce Ludowej* (Improving Planning and Functioning of the Economy in People's Poland.) Warsaw, PVE, 1968. 144 pp.

POPELOVA, J. *Rozpad klasické filosofie* (The Decline of Classical Philosophy.) Prague, Svoboda, 1968. 285 pp.

Revolutsionnoye dvizheniye v tsarskoi armii (Revolutionary Movement in the Tsarist Army. February 27-October 24, 1917.) Collection of documents. Moscow, Nauka, 1968. 621 pp.

SUSLOV, M. A. *Karl Marks—genialny uchi-teli vozhd rabochego klassa* (Karl Marx—Brilliant Teacher and Leader of the Working Class.) Report at the meeting in Moscow on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx. Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 40 pp.

Stat-Natiune-Progres social (The State, the Nation and Social Progress.) Collection by a group of authors. Bucharest, Editura politica, 1968. 397 pp.

VO NGUYEN GIAP. *Guerra di popolo* (A People's War.) Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1968. 62 pp.

Ustanovyavane na nauchna sistema na organizatsia na TKZS (The Establishment of a Scientific Organization of the Cooperative-Farm Union.) A group of authors. Sofia, Ban, 1968. 252 pp.

Unfuturo para Espana: la democracia economica y politica (The Future of Spain: Economic and Political Democracy.) A group of authors. Preface by Santiago Carrillo, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain. Paris, Librairie du Globe, 1967. 315 pp.

NEW FROM PROGRESS

NOTEBOOKS ON IMPERIALISM

by V. I. Lenin

Long-awaited 842-page Volume 39 of *Lenin's Collected Works*, containing the original materials Lenin gathered to write his classic work *Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. The *Notebooks* are of immense scientific value and represent an important contribution to Marxist political economy. Their current significance is that they form an invaluable background for current analysis of monopoly-capital both with regard to data and methodology.

Now is the time to subscribe to the complete expected 45-volume set of *Lenin's Collected Works*. Available now, Vols. 1-39 incl. at \$1.00 per volume if entire set is ordered. Single copies ordered individually \$1.75 each. Prices net plus shipping charges.

ORDER FROM:

progress books

487 adelaide st. w. / toronto 2b / 368-5336

new outlook publishers

32 union sq. east, rm. 801, new york, n.y. 10003, u.s.a.

Bound Volumes of World Marxist Review Available

Now available a limited number of bound volumes of World Marxist Review just back from the bindery. The following 2 volume (12 issues) sets are available: 1962; 1963 (one set only at present); 1964; 1965; 1966 and 1967. Price per 2-volume set \$25 net. As other bound volumes become available they will be announced. Write Progress Books, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 2B, Canada.

Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"



EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Groy's Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1, England

Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36, rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION
Stredisko pro rozšírování tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BRAZILIAN EDITION
(in Portuguese)
Rua da Assembléia, 34
3.º andar, sala 304,
Rio de Janeiro, Estado da Guanabara
Brazil

BULGARIAN EDITION
Raznalsnos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen
Sofia

CEYLON EDITION
(In Sinhalese)
91 Cotta Road
Colombo, Ceylon

CYPRUS EDITION
(in Greek)
Lalkon Praktorian,
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smekach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam W

GERMAN EDITIONS
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C I, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

HUNGARIAN EDITION
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Arpad-U6

ITALIAN EDITION
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

MONGOLIAN EDITION
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo,
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile
Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'a xuất nhập khẩu sách báo 32,
Hà Ba tru'ng, Hà-nôi